ALISTER E. MCGRATH



THE INTELLECTUAL ORIGINS OF THE EUROPEAN REFORMATION

SECOND EDITION

The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation

Second Edition

Alister E. McGrath

Blackwell Publishing

The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation

The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation

Second Edition

Alister E. McGrath

Blackwell Publishing

Copyright © 1987, 2004 by Alister E. McGrath

350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA
108 Cowley Road, Oxford OX4 1JF, UK
550 Swanston Street, Carlton, Victoria 3053, Australia

The right of Alister E. McGrath to be identified as the Author of this Work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

First edition published 1987 by Blackwell Publishers Ltd
Second edition first published 2004 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

McGrath, Alister E., 1953–
The intellectual origins of the European Reformation / Alister E. McGrath. – 2nd ed.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.
ISBN 0-631-22940-X (hardcover) – ISBN 0-631-22939-6 (pbk.)
1. Reformation. 2. Europe–Intellectual life. 3. Theology, Doctrinal–History–Middle Ages, 600-1500. 4. Philosophy, Medieval. 5. Theology, Doctrinal–History–16th century. 6. Philosophy, Renaissance. 7. Humanism–History. I. Title.

BR307.M44 2004
274′.06–dc21 2002155050

A catalogue record for this title is available from the British Library.

Set in 11/13pt Bembo
by Graphicraft Limited, Hong Kong
Printed and bound in the United Kingdom
by TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

For further information on
Blackwell Publishing, visit our website:
http://www.blackwellpublishing.com

Contents

Preface vii
Abbreviations x
Introduction 1

Part 1: The Intellectual Context 9

1 The Shape of Late Medieval Religious Thought 11
The Rise of Lay Religion 11
The Crisis of Authority Within the Church 15
The Development of Doctrinal Diversity 18
Forerunners of the Reformation 29

2 Humanism and the Reformation 34
Humanism: The Problem of Definition 34
Characteristic Features of Northern European Humanism 40
Humanism and the Origins of the Reformed Church 44
Humanism and the Origins of the Lutheran Church 58

3 Late Medieval Theology and the Reformation 67
Nominalism: The Problem of Definition 68
Via Moderna 73
Schola Augustiniana Moderna 82
Late Medieval Theology and the Origins of Reformed Theology 88
Late Medieval Theology and the Origins of Lutheran Theology 103

Part 2: Sources and Methods 117

4 Scripture: Translation, Text, and Tradition 119
The Medieval Consensus on the Theological Priority of Scripture 120
The Vulgate Translation of the Bible 121
The Humanist Return Ad Fontes 125
The Critique of the Vulgate 130
The Concept of Tradition 137
The Principle Sola Scriptura 144

5 The Interpretation of Scripture 148
Scholasticism: The Fourfold Sense of Scripture 148
Humanism: The Letter and the Spirit 150
Hermeneutics and the Origins of the Reformed Church 153
Hermeneutics and the Origins of the Lutheran Church 159

6 The Patristic Testimony 167
The Scholastic Reception of Augustine 168
The Humanist Reception of Augustine 173
The Patristic Testimony and the Origins of the Reformed Church 174
The Patristic Testimony and the Origins of the Lutheran Church 176

Conclusion: The Intellectual Heterogeneity of the Early Reformation 182
Notes 190
Select Bibliography 254
Index 273

Preface

The quest for the intellectual origins of the European Reformation of the sixteenth century has long been recognized as one of the most important recent undertakings in the study of intellectual history. Despite the tendency within certain schools of historical interpretation to disinvest the Reformation of any religious or intellectual character in order to facilitate its analysis as a purely social phenomenon, there is a growing realization that there is an irreducible intellectual element to the Reformation that demands and deserves careful analysis.

This book argues that such an analysis discloses that the intellectual origins of the Reformation are such that it cannot be thought of as a single coherent movement, whatever subsequent consolidation may have arisen through developments in its second phase. The two major streams of the Reformation – Lutheran and Reformed – have quite distinct and independent intellectual provenances. Historically, they can readily be demonstrated to have arisen independently of one another; theologically, they result from quite different understandings of the nature and manner of interpretation of the foundational resources of the Christian faith. While this study does not deal with the complex issue of the intellectual origins of the Radical Reformation, the clear divergence of this movement from both its Reformed and Lutheran counterparts at many critical junctures reinforces the conclusion that the European Reformation as a whole must be regarded as the outcome of a complex and nuanced series of micro-Reformations, each resting on essentially local understandings of theological sources and methods, whose subsequent interaction would define the shape of the macro-Reformation as a whole.

It must be made clear from the outset that social factors are of no small importance to the reception and transmission of ideas, whether

religious, political or scientific.[1] The way in which certain influential individuals understood and appropriated ideas, communities developed around them, and publications were established to propagate them, is an integral aspect of intellectual history, which recognizes the intrinsic importance of ideas in shaping culture and history, while also allotting a genuine role to social factors in their development, evaluation, and transmission.[2] An excellent example illustrating the complex interaction of social and intellectual factors is provided by the increasing influence of humanism in academic and ecclesiastical circles in the decade beginning 1510. While the intellectual attitudes of humanists altered relatively little over the period 1450–1530, the respect that they were accorded within the academic community increased substantially, with a concomitant enhancement of the impact of their ideas and methods within European universities.[3] The social status of a group was thus of critical importance in determining the impact of their ideas.

This book is primarily concerned with one crucial question: how may the religious ideas of the first generation of mainline Reformers – especially Luther and Zwingli – be accounted for? What factors – intellectual as well as social – brought them into being? The quest for the intellectual origins of the Reformation involves the detailed analysis of the continuities and discontinuities between two eras in the history of thought, raising questions of fundamental importance for the historian of ideas and the theologian. It is hoped that this book will go some way towards identifying those questions, and providing provisional answers to them.

My thanks are due to many for their kindnesses during the preparation of this work. The original stimulus for writing it was provided by my students at Oxford University, who demanded better answers to their questions concerning the origins of the ideas of the Reformation than they had hitherto found. The first edition of this work appeared in 1987, and met with a very appreciative reception. However, much has happened in recent years, and it has been clear for some time that a new edition was required, amending the original work, and extending its scope.

Much of the research underlying the first edition of this work (1987) was carried out at the Zentralbibliothek and Institut für schweizerische Reformationsgeschichte of the University of Zurich. Since then, I have benefited from the kindness of many institutions as I have developed, expanded, and revised the work. My thanks are due to the British

Academy for two generous research awards to permit me to study the early Swiss Reformation in some depth; and to Oxford University for awarding me the Denyer and Johnson Travelling Fellowship twice, allowing me to undertake research on the late Renaissance and early Reformation at a number of European centers. I am particularly grateful to the following institutions for their hospitality and the free use of their enviable resources: the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, the Biblioteca della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, and the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana (Florence); the Bibliothèque Publique et Universitaire and the Institut d'Histoire de la Réformation (Geneva); the Institute of Historical Research (London); the Bodleian Library (Oxford); the Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris); the Stadtsbibliothek Vadiana (St Gallen); the Österreichishe Nationalbibliothek and the Universitätsbibliothek (Vienna); the Institut für schweizerische Reformationsgeschichte and the Zentralbibliothek (Zurich). I also gratefully acknowledge the editorial assistance of Elizabeth McGrath. Finally, my thanks are again due to the staff and students of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, for providing such an outstanding environment in which to teach, study and think.

Abbreviations

ARG	*Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*
BHR	*Bibliotheque d'humanisme et Renaissance*
CR	*Corpus Reformatorum*
EthL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*
FS	*Franziskanische Studien*
FcS	*Franciscan Studies*
HThR	*Harvard Theological Review*
RThAM	*Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*
WA	*Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*
WABr	*Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Briefwechsel*
WATr	*Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Tischreden*
ZKG	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*
ZKTh	*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*
ZThK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

Introduction

The European Reformation of the sixteenth century continues to retain its inherent fascination for historians, whether they are primarily concerned with its social, political, or intellectual dimensions. Of the many questions to be thrown up by the continuing intense scholarly activity in the field, perhaps the most intriguing is the question of the intellectual origins of the Reformation. How may the origins of the distinctive religious ideas of the Reformation be accounted for in terms of the overall development of thought in the period 1300–1600? To what extent does the Reformation mark a break with the thought of an earlier period, and to what extent is it continuous with it? Indeed, to what extent can the Reformation itself be regarded as intellectually coherent – or must it be seen as an aggregate of smaller movements, loosely connected by shared aspirations and goals, while espousing quite different understandings of how these are to be conceptualized and achieved?

Four questions are of particular importance in this connection:

1 Can one speak of "the intellectual origins of the Reformation" in the first place? The use of the singular term "Reformation" implies a significant degree of coherence and homogeneity within the movement, so that its origins may be traced back to a common source.[1] But what if this movement turns out to be variegated in its intellectual underpinnings, and hence complex in its intellectual origins? Might it not be necessary to speak of "the intellectual origins of the Reformations"?
2 Were there "Forerunners of the Reformation"? In other words, were there anticipations of aspects of the thought of the Reformation in the medieval period that immediately preceded it?

3 What is the relationship between the Reformation and the Renaissance? Was the Reformation merely an aspect of the Renaissance, or does it possess special significance on account of its subject matter, presuppositions, sources, or methods?
4 What is the relationship between the Reformation and late medieval theological schools of thought, particularly the *via moderna* and the *schola Augustiniana moderna*? This question has been the subject of intense debate in relation to Luther's early theological development, but it is also important in relation to Karlstadt, Zwingli, Peter Martyr, and Calvin, to name but the more prominent among the Reformers. It is this question of the intellectual – as opposed to the political, social, or institutional – origins of the Reformation that urgently requires detailed critical examination.

The European Reformation of the sixteenth century was concerned with *religious ideas*. There was an intractably religious element to the movement, despite the fact that it also possessed political, social, and economic dimensions. It is perhaps inevitable that many modern western historians, familiar with a privatized religious ethos, will assume that religion has no role beyond the realm of personal spirituality. Yet this was not the case in the sixteenth century, and it is essential to cultivate a sense of historical empathy in which the past role of religion is honored, rather than projecting its later vestiges onto this earlier period. That religious ideas played a significant role in the Reformation may be seen particularly in the cases of Luther and Calvin. This is not to fall victim to a currently unfashionable idealist reading of history, but to note the significance of theology for many of those involved at critical junctures in the Reformation movement. Thus Luther's reforming program rested to a significant extent on his religious ideas, such as his understanding of the nature of the church, which in turn impacted upon the social changes he believed to be entailed by these ideas.

The preoccupation of many historians of the Reformation with social issues is due, in no small part, to many western sociologists in the second half of the twentieth century adopting approaches to history that were ultimately dependent upon a Marxist analysis of the origins of ideas, which held that ideologies – such as the theologies of the Reformation – were merely an ideational superstructure erected on a socioeconomic substructure. Although Marx himself appears to have

adopted a simple "base–superstructure" framework, which held that ideas were ultimately determined by their socioeconomic substructure, these ideas were developed more fully by his later followers. Georgii Plekhanov argued for a five-level model of a modern society, as follows:[2]

1 The state of the productive forces;
2 The economic relations that these forces engender;
3 The sociopolitical system that develops on this economic base;
4 The mentality of people living within this system, reflecting both its economic conditions and its sociopolitical system;
5 The ideologies that arise among these people, embodying that mentality.

Plekhanov thus argues that everything ultimately depends upon economics, but distinguishes a series of levels at which the fundamental economic forces operate. The link between "productive forces" and "ideologies" is thus not quite as straightforward as Marx suggests, and involves a more subtle identication and analysis of the interaction of the various strata than that which Marx himself proposes.[3] Nevertheless, it is clearly understood that the development of ideologies is determined by social and economic issues. On the basis of this approach to history, the Reformation is fundamentally to be approached at the level of social history, which holds the key to the origins and the determination of its distinctive ideas.[4]

The deep and wide currents that the Reformation created in the flow of European history are an adequate testimony to the political and social dimensions of the movement. Nevertheless, those at the forefront of the Swiss and German Reformations had a clear concern for religious ideas, and based their political and social programs upon them. The historical significance of the Reformation is not merely inseparable from, but is largely a consequence of, the religious views of the major Reformers. Any attempt to understand the complexity of the sixteenth century Reformation must involve a serious engagement with the ideas that lay behind it.[5] So how did the distinctive ideas of the Reformation come into being? And in what way do these ideas differ from those of the centuries prior to the Reformation? Is the religious thought of the Reformation a natural outcome of late medieval thought, or does it represent a break with a hitherto homogeneous intellectual tradition?

To answer these questions with any degree of precision and conviction, it is necessary to examine the manner in which theological ideas were developed and analyzed in the late medieval period, as well as the extent to which they could be – and were – controlled and regulated by both society and the church.[6] Late medieval church and society exercised an ambiguous attitude toward religious ideas, which was both creative and repressive. By establishing a political and intellectual climate throughout much of western Europe in which theological scholarship and speculation could proceed, the church may be said to have adopted a creative attitude toward the development of new religious ideas; by establishing means by which unacceptable new ideas might be eliminated or suppressed, by force if necessary, the church may be said to have adopted a repressive attitude in the same area. Perhaps one of the more significant features of the fifteenth century is the evident growth in theological speculation – and hence doctrinal pluralism – in the religious houses and universities of Germany, and an apparently increasing reluctance or inability on the part of the church authorities to suppress this trend.

The present work represents an attempt to consolidate and expand our understanding of the intellectual origins of the European Reformation of the sixteenth century. There has been a growing recognition on the part of Reformation scholars that neither the events nor the ideas of the sixteenth century may be properly understood unless they are seen as the culmination of developments in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.[7] Although there has been an understandable desire on the part of historians of the Reformation to treat the pivotal intellectual developments of the sixteenth century as complete in themselves, requiring little contextualization other than that provided by the early years of that century, certain assumptions underlying this approach have recently been called into question. For example, it is evident that both Protestant and Roman Catholic theologians of today have come to regard the sixteenth century as defining the point of departure for their present doctrinal positions, and thus tend to approach the period in the light of this assumption, with significant implications for the way in which its history is read, and the importance that is attached to it.[8] While this may be perfectly acceptable for their somewhat limited purposes, it is most emphatically not acceptable to the historian of ideas, whose task and concern it is to account for the origins of the ideas that assumed such significance in the sixteenth century.

A further difficulty relates to the vexed question of periodization. How is the "period of the Reformation" to be defined? And to what epoch may the Reformation itself be assigned? For example, the Reformation may be viewed as the culmination of the Renaissance emphasis upon *studia humanitatis* – and thus merely as an episode in the general history of learning and scholarship over the period 1300–1600.[9] Alternatively, on the basis of the Marxist interpretation of the place of the Reformation in European history – in which the superstructure of the history of its religious ideas is seen as inextricably linked with the substructure of the class struggle – the movement is viewed as a significant epoch in the development of the European bourgeois revolution.[10] A further possibility is to view the Reformation as a significant episode in the transition of European countries from territorial states to sovereign powers in the period 1450–1660.[11] The danger is clearly that such periodization is imposed upon, rather than discerned within, the historical process itself.

The assumption underlying the present study is that the Reformation represents a significant episode in the intellectual, institutional, social, and political history of Europe, capable of being accommodated within a number of schemes of periodization on account of its multifaceted character. For the present purposes, however, the Reformation will be viewed primarily as an intellectual phenomenon. This is not to deny that it possessed other dimensions, nor even to assert that the intellectual element of the Reformation must be regarded as taking precedence over others. It is simply to observe that there was an irreducible intellectual element to the movement, which exercised considerable influence over it, and which thus both merits and demands serious study by all concerned with the Reformation. The Reformation occupies, and must continue to occupy, a legitimate and significant place in the history of ideas. The significance of the period to the self-understanding of the major western Christian traditions obviously lends added weight to these considerations.

While not necessarily suggesting that certain periods in history are genuinely more significant than others, the full significance of any such period – and the Reformation is clearly a case in point – can only be established through comparison with those that preceded it, and those that followed. It is for this reason that it is so important to establish the areas of continuity and discontinuity between the religious thought of the Reformation and that of the late medieval period, in that it is only

through this process that the innovative character and originality of the Reformation may be identified and established.

It will therefore be clear that an essential part of the present task will be the elucidation of the relationship to the religious ideas of the later Middle Ages of both the emerging Lutheran and Reformed theologies, in their formative periods, and the sources and methods employed in their establishment and articulation. It is difficult to speak of "the intellectual origins of the Reformation," in that the movement simply did not possess the coherence and homogeneity which this phrase suggests. The origins of the Reformations at Wittenberg and Zurich are quite distinct, as will become clear from the analysis presented in this volume. For this reason, a distinction between the Lutheran and Reformed theological communities has been accepted. In part, this reflects the fact that the Wittenberg and Zurich Reformations exercised a significant impact on their regions,[12] and can be argued to have brought into being quite distinct (yet not unrelated) understandings both of the Reformation as a process, and of its distinctive ideas.

Yet there is another reason for accepting this distinction between these two Reformations. It is impossible to approach this question without being affected by the ecclesiological polarizations of the Reformation era, which continue to affect Reformation scholarship to this day. The growing religious and political tensions within Germany in the 1560s and beyond caused an increasingly sharp distinction to be drawn between "Lutheran" and "Reformed" as epithets applied to the two main confessions that developed within the Reformation.[13] In the early period of the Reformation, the Reformers regarded themselves as evangelicals committed to a common program of theological education and reform. By the second half of the century, however, it was evident that a major bifurcation had occurred within the movement (if, indeed, it had not always been there from the beginning). The political roots of this fissure may be traced back to the abortive Colloquy of Marburg (1529);[14] its intellectual roots, however, must be traced back further, as we shall demonstrate in this volume. By the 1550s, this political bifurcation was complete. One section of the movement, broadly corresponding to the German territories, regarded Luther, his catechisms, and the Augsburg Confession as theological authorities, whereas the cities of the Rhineland and Switzerland recognized the rival authority of Calvin and his *Institutio*, and the Heidelberg Catechism.[15] Although it is evident that the two movements still regarded themselves as heirs

to a common tradition,[16] political and ecclesiological developments, particularly the rise of confessionalism, led to an emphasis upon their divergence, rather than upon their convergence upon matters once held to be fundamental to the Reformation.[17]

The developments leading to the introduction of the term "Calvinism" illustrate this point. In the sixth decade of the sixteenth century, a new theological term entered the polemical literature of the churches of the Reformation. "Calvinism" appears to have been introduced by the Lutheran polemicist Joachim Westphal to refer to the theological, and particularly the sacramental, views of the Swiss Reformers in general, and John Calvin in particular.[18] Once introduced, the term rapidly passed into general use within the Lutheran church. In part, this rapid acceptance of the new term reflected intense disquiet within the Lutheran camp concerning the growing influence of Reformed theology in regions of Germany hitherto regarded as historically Lutheran.[19] Elector Frederick III's open support for the Reformed theology in the Palatinate, especially his introduction of the celebrated Heidelberg Catechism in 1563, was the cause of particular concern. The defection of the Elector from the Lutheran to the Reformed party was widely regarded as an open infringement of the Peace of Augsburg,[20] and a destabilizing influence in the region.

The introduction of the term "Calvinist" thus appears to have been an attempt to stigmatize Reformed theology as a foreign influence in Germany. Calvin himself was alarmed at the use of the term, which he rightly regarded as a thinly veiled attempt to discredit the Elector's espousal of the Reformed faith.[21] By then, however, Calvin had only months to live, and his protest was ineffective. The term "Calvinism" thus came to be used to refer to the theological views of the Reformed church by its opponents. Students of the Reformation period thus find themselves viewing the period through the distorting lens arising from this most dubious bequest of early Protestant internecine politics. The precise relationship between Calvin and Reformed theology, particularly in the period after the death of Calvin, is considerably more complex than might be expected, and the use of the term "Calvinism" to refer to that theology is to be discouraged.

The present study is conceived as an investigation and interpretation of the relationship between the two wings of the Reformation and the two great intellectual movements of the late medieval period – scholasticism and humanism – with a view to clarifying the intellectual origins

of the European Reformation. This analysis involves both a general overview of the relation between the Reformation and these intellectual movements, as well as a sustained examination of the Reformers' appropriation of the understandings of theological sources and methods associated with these movements. The study opens with a survey of religious thought in the two centuries immediately preceding the Reformation, documenting the inherent doctrinal pluralism that proved to be so effective a breeding ground for the ideas of the Reformers, and allowing the traditional concept of the "Forerunners of the Reformation" to be critically evaluated.

In the two major chapters that follow, the broad outlines of the relation of the Reformation to both humanism and late medieval scholasticism are delineated, taking full note of the developments in our understanding of the nature of both these movements that have been gained in the last half-century, and which have necessitated modification of many traditional interpretations of their relation. These broad outlines are then further developed by three subsequent chapters, dealing with the basis of all theological speculation – the understanding of the sources and the methods to be used. On the basis of this analysis, the clear divergence between the relationship of the early Lutheran and Reformed churches to humanism and late medieval scholasticism becomes evident, accentuating the incoherence of the notion of a single Reformation, as opposed to a series of distinct, yet interlocking and interacting, Reformations. This point is developed more fully in the conclusion, and its implications for our understanding of the Reformation assessed.

But enough of such preliminaries. We must turn to consider the intricacies of the backdrop to the Reformation in the confluence of Renaissance humanism and late medieval scholasticism, as we attempt to cast some light on how that movement came into being, and forged its distinctive ideas.

Part 1
The Intellectual Context

1

The Shape of Late Medieval Religious Thought

The intellectual, social, and spiritual upheavals of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries define the context within which the development of the Reformation of the sixteenth century must be approached. Although it has often been suggested in the past that the late Middle Ages was merely a period of general cultural and theological disintegration,[1] it is now appreciated that it was also a period of remarkable development which sets the scene for the Reformation itself.[2] In this chapter, I propose to present a general survey of the religious situation in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as a prelude to an analysis of areas of continuity between the late medieval and Reformation periods.

The Rise of Lay Religion

It is now generally agreed that the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries did not witness the general decline in interest in the Christian religion in western Europe that was once thought to have taken place.[3] A careful examination of parameters such as church attendance or religious bequests and endowments – not to mention the new interest in pilgrimages and personal devotion – points to the vitality of Christian life in pre-Reformation Europe.[4] The remarkable number and variety of books published for private devotional purposes is a clear indication of how important lay piety had become within an increasingly articulate and affluent laity.[5] Although it is clear that there was a growing anticlericalism in many European cities,[6] the development of this phenomenon was not solely a reflection of growing irritation with clerical privilege.[7] The rise in piety and theological awareness on the part of the laity – particularly evident in the manner in which speculative

theology was subordinated to Marian devotion in popular literature[8] – inevitably led to a growing dissatisfaction with the role allocated to the clergy in the order of salvation.

The close relationship that existed between education and lay piety in the later Middle Ages is indicated by the fact that the remarkable growth of interest in education in the fifteenth century was primarily associated with monastic houses, particularly those of the *devotio moderna*. The Brethren of the Common Life occupy a strategic location, historically and theologically, in that their distinctive conception of the nature of the religious life can be argued to mediate between the cloister and the world, engendering values and attitudes that can be seen as characteristic of the transition from the medieval to the early modern period.[9] The *devotio moderna* can be regarded as the distinctive spirituality associated with the order, which undergirded its programs of education and monastic reform.[10] Although the early *devotio moderna* was not primarily concerned with popular education, but rather with the reformation of monasteries,[11] it rapidly assumed a major pedagogical role in the fifteenth century. The student hostels attached to the major monasteries of the Brethren of the Common Life extended their interest in the pastoral welfare of their students to include their education. Inevitably, the piety of the *devotio moderna* was transmitted in this education process. The monastic educational program resulted in an increasing consciousness of the rudiments of a well-established spiritual tradition, as well as the elements of Latin grammar, in the laity of the later medieval period.

The connection between the *devotio moderna* and individuals such as Erasmus,[12] and institutions such as the universities of Paris[13] and Tübingen,[14] serves to indicate how piety and pedagogy were intermingled in the period. Although there are indications that the educational standards of the clergy were themselves improving toward the end of the fifteenth century, the new educational movements were steadily eroding the advantage the clergy once enjoyed over the laity. All the indications are that piety and religion, if not theology itself, were becoming increasingly laicized toward the end of the medieval period.

The impact of the rising professional groups in cities throughout Europe in the late fifteenth century was considerable. No longer could a priest expect to satisfy his urban congregation by reading a Latin sermon as an adjunct to the reading of the mass – an intelligent and fresh sermon was required, if the priest was to be seen to justify his

position within society. No longer could he expect to justify his privileged position in urban society merely with reference to his calling.[15] At a time of economic depression there was widespread criticism of priests, who were both supported by the public and exempted from the often punitive taxes they faced.

The phenomenon of anticlericalism was widespread, and not specifically linked to any area of Europe. In part, the phenomenon reflects the low quality of the rank and file clergy. In Renaissance Italy, it was common for parish priests to have had virtually no training; what little they knew they gleaned from watching, helping, and imitating. Diocesan visitations regularly revealed priests who were illiterate, or had apparently permanently mislaid their breviaries. The poor quality of the parish clergy reflected their low social status: in early sixteenth-century Milan, chaplains had incomes lower than those of unskilled laborers. Many resorted to horse and cattle trading to make ends meet.[16] In rural France during the same period, the clergy enjoyed roughly the same social status as vagabonds: their exemption from taxation, prosecution in civil courts, and compulsory military service apart, they were virtually indistinguishable from other itinerant beggars of the period.[17]

The French situation illustrates especially well the growing alienation of the laity from their clergy. The fiscal privileges enjoyed by clergy were the source of particular irritation, especially in times of economic difficulty. In the French diocese of Meaux, which would become a center for reforming activists in the period 1521–46, the clergy were exempted from all forms of taxation, including charges relating to the provisioning and garrisoning of troops, which provoked considerable local resentment. In the diocese of Rouen, there was popular outcry over the windfall profits made by the church by selling grain at a period of severe shortage.[18] Clerical immunity from prosecution in civil courts further isolated the clergy from the people.

In France, the subsistence crises of the 1520s played a major role in the consolidation of anticlerical attitudes. In his celebrated study of Languedoc, Le Roy Ladurie pointed out that the 1520s witnessed a reversal of the process of expansion and recovery that had been characteristic of the two generations since the ending of the Hundred Years War.[19] From that point onward, a crisis began to develop, taking the form of plague, famine, and migration of the rural poor to the cities in search of food and employment. A similar pattern has now been identified for the period in most of France north of the Loire.[20] This

subsistence crisis focused popular attention on the gross disparity between the fate of the lower classes and the nobles and ecclesiastical establishment.

The vast majority of late Renaissance bishops in France were drawn from the nobility,[21] a trend illustrated by diocese after diocese. In Meaux, the higher echelons of the ecclesiastical establishment were drawn from the urban patriciate, as were the senior clergy throughout the Brie.[22] In the province of Languedoc, the senior clergy were generally outsiders, often nobility imposed upon the dioceses by royal patronage. Rarely resident within their dioceses, these clergy regarded their spiritual and temporal charges as little more than sources of unearned income, useful for furthering political ambitions elsewhere. The noble background and status of the episcopacy and senior clergy served to distance them from the artisans and peasants, and to insulate them from the economic subsistence crisis of the 1520s.

This increasing anticlericalism must not, however, be seen as a reaction against the Christian religion itself, but merely as a growing dissatisfaction with the role and status of the clergy within an increasingly professional urbanized, yet still Christian, society. Similarly, the rising hostility toward scholasticism in theology must not be thought to imply a decline in popular interest in religion,[23] but actually reflects both a growing theological competence on the part of some of the laity (and Erasmus may serve as an example), and increasing interest in nonacademic forms of religion (often expressed in pietistic, sentimental, or external forms) on the part of others.[24] To dismiss this latter form of religious expression as "superstition" is for the historian to impose improperly a modern *Weltanschauung* upon this very different period in history.

The advent of printing led to works of popular devotion becoming increasingly accessible to the intelligent and literate laity, and appears to have contributed considerably to the promotion of popular piety, particularly through the growing body of devotional material that now began to appear.[25] This technological development was of particular importance in contributing to the remarkable success of Erasmus's *Enchiridion Militis Christiani* in the first decades of the sixteenth century, a success that unquestionably reflects the fact that it was addressed to precisely such an articulate lay piety, expressing that piety in an intelligent and intelligible form.[26] Thus Erasmus's criticisms of scholastic theology were directed against the form in which it was expressed – particularly the rather inelegant forms of Latin employed by linguistically

challenged scholastic theologians – rather than against the religious ideas that it articulated.[27] The remarkable impact of the *Hortulus Animae* at Strasbourg – which went through 25 editions in the 19 years following its publication in 1498 – is a typical testimony to the vitality of the interiorized piety characteristic of the urban professional classes of the later medieval period.[28] It is also clear that there was an essential continuity between the piety of the *devotio moderna* and that of the Reformation,[29] thus indicating the fertile ground upon which the new religious outlook associated with the sixteenth century movement would fall.

The Crisis of Authority Within the Church

While the challenge to the authority of the church posed by the rise of the lay religious consciousness must not be underestimated, a more serious challenge to that authority had arisen within the church itself. The late medieval period witnessed a crisis in ecclesiastical authority that would ultimately find its expression in the astonishing doctrinal diversity of the fifteenth century. The fourteenth century appears to have opened without any real awareness of what the future held in this respect. The Jubilee of 1300 constituted a splendid backdrop to the publication of *Unam sanctam* in 1302, marking the zenith of medieval papal ecclesiastical ambitions.[30] The apparent moral victory that the Pope had secured over the French monarch was, however, shown to be hollow through the humiliation of Anagni, and the establishment of the Avignon papacy in 1309.[31] The fact that the theological authority of the Avignon popes was largely based upon that of the theology faculty at Paris serves to demonstrate the severe restrictions placed upon them in this respect. Although the Parisian theology faculty supported the condemnation of William of Ockham in 1339,[32] in 1333–4 it had forced upon an unwilling John XXII a humiliating alteration of his pronouncement on the beatific vision.[33] The condemnation of Ockham is faintly ironical, in that one of Ockham's chief targets in his *Tractatus contra Johannem* was none other than John XXII's pronouncement on the beatific vision.[34] Ockham has, however, added significance on account of his theory of the sources of Christian doctrine. In his *Opus nonaginta dierum*, Ockham developed a theory of doctrinal authority that denied the pope (or, indeed, an ecumenical council) any right to legislate in matters of faith.[35] There was thus no fundamental

means by which the pope might resolve the contemporary diversity of belief concerning the eucharist or the assumption of the Virgin,[36] or legislate to eliminate the doctrinal diversity that ensued from the erosion of papal authority.

The death of the last Avignonese pope (Gregory XI) led to the Schism of 1378–1417, culminating in the recognition of three rival claimants to the papacy in the aftermath of the Council of Pisa (1409).[37] It is difficult to overestimate the impact of the "Babylonian Captivity" of the papacy at Avignon and the ensuing schism upon the medieval church. To whom should believers look for an authoritative – or even a provisional – statement concerning the faith of the church? In a period of unprecedented expansion in theological speculation within the university theological faculties and religious houses of western Europe, guidance was urgently required as to the catholicity of the new methods and doctrines that were emerging. The traditional method of validation of such opinions was by reference to the teaching of the institutional church, objectified in the episcopacy and the papacy, yet the theological and moral integrity of the institution of the church itself appeared to many to be called into question by the events of the Great Schism, and the period immediately preceding it. Furthermore, Ockham had called into question the role of both the papacy and ecumenical councils in such a process of validation, and initiated a debate over this matter continued by Pierre d'Ailly, Jean Gerson, and Johannes Breviscoxa.[38] The development of the astonishing doctrinal diversity of the late fourteeth and fifteenth centuries is probably due to the apparent suspension of the normal methods of validation of theological opinions, together with an apparent reluctance (or possibly even an inability) on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities to take decisive action against heterodox views as and when they arose.[39]

The weakening in the fifteenth century of the means by which orthodoxy might be enforced became more pronounced in the first half of the sixteenth century, as factors such as the continued rise of nationalism in northern Europe, the Franco-Italian war, and the Hapsburg–Valois conflict combined to make the suppression of heterodoxy by force considerably more difficult. The nationalist overtones of the early reforming movements and growing independence of the Swiss and southern German cities, to name no other factors, considerably diminished the ability of the curia to respond to the growing ideological and political threat from north of the Alps. Furthermore, Hadrian

VI failed to press for the convening of diocesan and provincial synods in northern Europe during the years when the possibility of suppressing the new movements was greatest (1522–3). The factors leading to the erosion of such centralized power as had previously existed at this crucial period in history are not fully understood; however, the consequences of this erosion of power are all too obvious, in that the new reforming movements were allowed to develop with minimal hindrance.

The Great Schism was ended by the Council of Constance (1414–17), which elected Martin V as pope on November 11, 1417.[40] The circumstances under which this council was convened, however, were to occasion a further crisis of authority within the church. In that there were several claimants to the papacy, it was widely held that the only manner in which the matter might be settled was through the convening of an ecumenical council. The fifth session of the Council enacted the decree *Haec sancta*, which affirmed that its authority was derived directly from Christ, and was to be respected even by popes. Although it was on the basis of this presupposition that the election of Martin V took place, the assumption that such authority was invested in a council (rather than the pope) led to disagreement concerning its ecumenicity.[41] The subsequent undermining of the conciliarist position,[42] culminating in Pius II's bull *Execrabilis* (1460), did not defuse the crucial theological question arising from the rise of the Conciliar Movement: who had the authority to validate theological opinions – the pope, a council, or perhaps even a professor of theology? It was this uncertainty that contributed to no small extent to the quite remarkable doctrinal diversity of the late medieval church.

An additional threat to the authority of the church, understood at both the political and theological levels, arose from the rapid expansion of printing. This new technology permitted the transmission of ideas from one locality to another with unprecedented ease, and posed a formidable challenge to those wishing to ensure conformity to existing ecclesiastical beliefs and practices.[43] The hapless task faced, for example, by the French religious authorities as they attempted to stem the flood of evangelical pamphlets and books in Paris from 1520 onwards is an important indication of the general difficulty of controlling ideas in the later Renaissance.[44] The enforcement of intellectual conformity became an increasingly difficult business throughout western Europe, as the widespread distribution of books broke down traditional social and political barriers to the dissemination of new ideas.

The Development of Doctrinal Diversity

The doctrinal diversity so characteristic of the later medieval period cannot be explained on the basis of any single development. However, of the various factors contributing to this development, in addition to the absence of magisterial pronouncements, several may be singled out as being of particular importance. First, it is clear that a number of quite distinct theological schools emerged during the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, with differing philosophical presuppositions and methods. These schools tended to be based upon, or associated with, specific religious orders. As a result, various quite distinct approaches to theology, differing both in substance and in emphasis, may be discerned within the late medieval period. Second, there was considerable disagreement on the nature of the sources of Christian theology, and their relative priority. Of particular importance in this respect is the absence of general agreement concerning the status and method of interpretation of both Scripture and the writings of Augustine of Hippo.[45] Third, the tension between the rival logico-critical and historico-critical methods became increasingly significant in the later fourteenth century, with a concomitant polarization in areas of doctrine sensitive to methodological presuppositions (such as Christology and the doctrine of justification). Fourth, the rise of lay piety – an important phenomenon for many reasons – proved a near-irresistible force for development in certain areas of theology, particularly Mariology, as an expression of the beliefs and attitudes underlying popular devotional practice and reflection. Fifth, in certain areas of doctrine – most notably the doctrine of justification – there appears to have been considerable confusion during the first decades of the sixteenth century concerning the specifics of the official teaching of the church, with the result that doctrinal diversity arose through uncertainty over whether a given opinion corresponded to the teaching of the church or not. Some of these factors may conveniently be considered at this point, before being developed further in later chapters.

Although the development of theological schools may be traced to the establishment of Tours, Reims, St Gall, Reichenau, and Laon as centers of learning in the ninth century,[46] the rise of the great theological schools is especially associated with the late eleventh and twelfth centuries, in the aftermath of the Gregorian reforms. By the end of the

twelfth century, Paris had become established as the theological center of Europe.[47] Its theological schools propagated both the views of, and the disagreement among, masters such as Peter Abelard, Gilbert of Poitiers, Peter Lombard, and Hugh of St Victor. It was, however, events of the thirteenth century that are of decisive importance for our present purposes. The Dominicans and Franciscans arrived at Paris in the second decade of the thirteenth centuries, and gradually wrested three chairs of theology from the control of secular masters to that of their orders.[48] The opinions of the first Dominican and Franciscan professors (Roland of Cremona OP and John of St Giles OFM) came to be perpetuated in the teachings of the early Dominican and Franciscan schools, culminating in the teachings of Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventure respectively.[49] A distinct school appears to have developed slightly later within the Augustinian Order, based upon the writings of Giles of Rome.[50] The impact of the teaching of Duns Scotus, and subsequently that of William of Ockham and his followers, in the early fourteenth century, led to further diversification within these schools, with the rise of the later Franciscan school, the *via moderna* and the *schola Augustiniana moderna*, to name but the most significant. Although these schools tended to be linked with specific religious orders, it is clear that there was considerable diversity of belief within such orders.

Although Carl Stange argued, in a study dating from the beginning of the twentieth century,[51] that late medieval theology was essentially and fundamentally a theology of religious orders – so that Dominicans followed the teachings of Thomas Aquinas, the Franciscans those of Bonaventure, and the Augustinians those of Giles of Rome or Gregory of Rimini – subsequent more detailed studies have demonstrated that this judgment cannot be sustained. Other factors were readily identified as significant influences on shaping schools of thought. Of particular importance was the role of local universities in molding distinctive intellectual identities. Thus Hermelink pointed out how the Dominicans at Cologne were significantly influenced by the *via antiqua*, whereas those at Vienna and Erfurt were more responsive to the ideas of the *via moderna* – these differences corresponding to the philosophical and theological schools that were dominant within the local university faculty of arts.[52] Robert Holcot OP exemplifies the tendency for leading Dominicans to be influenced by currents of thought (in this case, the *via moderna*) originating from outside their specific religious order.[53] A similar observation might be made concerning the influence of the

via moderna on the Augustinian priory at Erfurt in the final years of the sixteenth century.[54] Furthermore, it is clear that there was considerable tension within the later medieval Franciscan Order concerning the relative status of Bonaventure and Duns Scotus, each of whom could lay claim to the title of doctor of that order. This became particularly apparent at the Council of Trent, where the occasionally wide differences between the two doctors on points of theological importance could no longer be ignored.[55] lndeed, there are reasons for supposing that the chief contribution of the Franciscans to the intellectual life of the late medieval period was primarily its distinctive and influential spirituality,[56] rather than any coherent theological system. It will therefore be clear that there was potentially a remarkably broad spectrum of theological opinions current within the universities and religious orders of Europe on the eve of the Reformation, simply on account of the diversity of theological schools and the absence of well-defined and strictly enforced spheres of influence (such as specific countries, universities, or religious orders) by which their teachings might be restricted or controlled.

A further contributing factor to the development of rampant doctrinal plurality in the later medieval period was the controversy between the *via antiqua* and *via moderna* concerning the merits of the logico-critical method in theology. This conflict – exemplified in microcosm in the fourteenth-century disputes within the Augustinian Order[57] – was pregnant with theological significance in relation to numerous areas of doctrine, including Christology and the theology of justification. The use of the dialectic between the two powers of God by theologians of the later Franciscan schools – the *via moderna* and the *schola Augustiniana moderna* – called into question the foundations of certain traditional doctrines. The appeal to the dialectic between the two powers of God was based upon the distinction between the ordained (*potentia Dei ordinata*) and absolute (*potentia Dei absoluta*) powers of God.[58] A dialectic was set up between things as they might have been, and things as they actually are, corresponding to the absolute and ordained powers of God respectively.[59] In view of the widespread misunderstanding of the nature and purpose of this dialectic, a brief account of this device is called for, before moving on to consider its implications for doctrinal pluralism.

The essential point made by those who appealed to the dialectic between the powers of God was that the present created order, including

the order of salvation, did not result from God acting *of necessity*. Out of the initial set of potentialities open to actualization by God, only a subset was actualized. The argument runs as follows. Before any decision concerning which potentialities should be actualized, God was at liberty to select any from among them, subject solely to the condition that this should not involve logical contradiction. The fact that it is impossible to construct a triangle with four sides is thus not understood to involve any restriction upon God's course of action in this respect. God has determined which potentialities shall be actualized, and has executed this decision. As a result, God is now under a self-imposed restriction in regard to future actions. In other words, once God has decided to create and work within a certain order, God is under an obligation to respect this order. Yet this is not a case of God being under external constraint, or acting of necessity. Having chosen to act in certain ways, God remains faithful to those decisions. If God is constrained, it is by none other than God.

Duns Scotus thus points out that the present established created order is essentially an expression of the divine wisdom and benevolence, rather than the result of a necessity imposed upon God from outside.[60] This point is taken up and developed by Ockham, who emphasizes that the dialectic between two powers of God does not imply that there are two *present* courses of action open to God;[61] but simply that the moral and physical ordering of creation must be recognized to be contingent, rather than necessary, in that God could have ordained a different ordering within the world. The effect of this kind of analysis was to focus attention on the apparent weaknesses of the foundations of certain significant doctrines, which were now revealed to be less rigorous than many had believed. Consideration of two such doctrines will illustrate this point in a little more detail.

The theologians of the thirteenth century were virtually unanimous in their opinion that justification involved certain "created habits of grace."[62] This opinion was substantiated on the grounds that such a created habit was intrinsically necessary, on account of the natures of sin and grace – in other words, that such a habit of grace was necessary *ex natura rei*. The appeal to the dialectic between the two powers of God called this alleged "necessity" into question: had God so desired, a completely different means of justifying humanity could have been devised. While not actually calling into question the *de facto* necessity of such habits, the original grounds upon which their necessity had been

deduced by an earlier generation of theologians were now completely eroded.[63] As a result, the main theological schools of the fourteenth century – such as the modern Franciscan school, the *via moderna*, and the *schola Augustiniana moderna* – now regarded the divine acceptation itself, rather than any created habit of grace, as the immediate cause of justification. God was free to do things – such as justifying humanity – *directly* that might otherwise be done through created intermediates (such as habits of grace). This significant shift in opinion is important for two reasons. First, it indicates how the new logico-critical method posed a powerful challenge to received doctrines and their original theological foundations, and thus contributed significantly to the doctrinal pluralism of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Second, it suggested that the present order of salvation was radically contingent, merely one of a number of possibilities, thus undermining its permanent significance. Far from being determined by the intrinsic nature of the realities involved, it was now seen to rest upon the sovereign will of God.

This impression was confirmed by Ockham's analysis of the doctrine of the incarnation, which recognized the possibility that God could have become incarnate in the form of a stone, a block of wood, or even as an ass – rather than as a human being.[64] To many critics, the application of the logico-critical method seemed to lead directly to the complete disintegration of the traditional structure of Christian doctrine, resulting in a Nestorian Christology and a Pelagian soteriology.[65] The rise of the logico-critical method thus led not merely to a diversification in late medieval theological opinions, but also to the laying down of an implicit yet fundamental challenge to the foundations of much traditional Christian theology. Diversification was inevitable; a loss of theological confidence was also a distinct possibility.

It was thus clear that plurality, in at least certain areas of Christian doctrine, was inevitable. For example, the Great Schism gave rise to a range of ecclesiologies as the church's theologians attempted to grapple with the theoretical difficulties arising from the evident disunity within the church.[66] The settled ecclesiologies of the twelfth centuries no longer seemed to work, given the new ecclesiastical realities.[67] How could the true church be defined, when there was such significant disagreement over the identify of its head, and the locus of its authority? Yet even in those areas of theology where greater doctrinal coherence might have been expected, considerable diversity developed.[68]

The erosion of traditional understandings of the authority of certain individuals played no small part in this development. One such individual was Augustine of Hippo.

The influence of Augustine upon the emergence and consolidation of the medieval theological tradition was immense.[69] He is by far the most frequently cited writer in Peter Lombard's *Sententiarum Libri Quattuor*. Although practically every late medieval theologian recognized the authority of Augustine of Hippo – a consideration which might at first sight suggest a basis for theological coherence – it must nevertheless be appreciated that there was actually little agreement at the time on how Augustine was to be interpreted. The rise of the historico-critical method within the Augustinian Order during the fourteenth century is of particular importance in this respect, as it marked a recognition of the need to establish reliable Augustinian texts as a necessary prelude to their interpretation.[70] The Middle Ages was plagued by a large number of texts attributed to certain classical writers, yet whose credentials were increasingly being questioned. The spurious work on "theology" attributed to Aristotle and Constantine's *Donation* (exposed as a forgery in the fifteenth century by Lorenzo Valla) are excellent examples of such writings.[71] Many works now known to be pseudonymous were seriously attributed to such leading theologians as Jerome and Augustine of Hippo during the Middle Ages, with significant implications for theological development.

The remakable number of pseudo-Augustinian texts in circulation at the time seriously hindered the establishment of Augustine's views,[72] particularly in the critically important area of soteriology. The pseudo-Augustinian treatise *Hypomnesticon* is of particular significance, on account of its obvious sympathy for the "semi-Pelagianism" of writers such as John Cassian, which represented a significant divergence from Augustine's authentic views on this matter. Things were made worse by the general tendency among theologians of the period to use collections of *sententiae*, rather than consulting original works at first hand, which inevitably led to Augustinian citations being used out of context, and occasionally totally inappropriately. An excellent example of this phenomenon may be seen in the case of the late fifteenth-century theologian Gabriel Biel. While considering the relation between grace and free will in justification, Biel alludes to Augustine's image of a horse and its rider to make a point. By confusing this image with a similar illustration found in the pseudo-Augustinian *Hypomnesticon* a

total inversion of Augustine's meaning results.[73] It is probable that Biel derived both this illustration and its quite inappropriate interpretation at second hand from Duns Scotus.[74] Nor was it merely doctors of antiquity who proved difficult to interpret, as the controversy during the early years of the fourteenth century surrounding the true nature of the teachings of Thomas Aquinas was to prove.[75]

The rising influence of lay piety is particularly marked upon the Mariological controversies of the late medieval period. Two rival positions developed: the *maculist* position, which held that Mary was subject to original sin, in common with every other human being; and the *immaculist* position, which held the contrary view that Mary was in some way preserved from original sin, and was thus to be considered sinless. The maculist position was regarded as firmly established within the High Scholasticism of the thirteenth century. The veneration of the Virgin within popular piety, however, proved to have an enormously creative power that initially challenged, and subsequently triumphed over, the academic objections raised against it by university theologians.[76] Significantly, it was the theologians of the Franciscan Order who supported the new doctrine in the face of opposition from the Dominicans: the former are known to have had deep popular roots largely denied to their more academic Dominican opponents. The early fourteenth century saw increasing support for the immaculists, initially within the Franciscan Order,[77] and subsequently within the universities and elsewhere. Of especial interest is the rapid acceptance of the doctrine of the immaculate conception within the Augustinian Order. The earlier Augustinians, such as Giles of Rome, Albert of Padua, Augustinus Triumphus of Ancona, and Gregory of Rimini, were strongly maculist.[78] In the middle of the fourteenth century however, a remarkable shift in opinion took place, beginning with theologians such as Johannes Hiltalingen of Basel, Henry of Friemar, and Thomas of Strasbourg, and continuing into the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, with Jacobus Perez of Valencia,[79] Johannes de Paltz,[80] and Johannes von Staupitz[81] adopting the immaculist opinion. The fourteenth century thus witnessed remarkable fluidity in this matter.

The development of this doctrine also emphasized the prevailing uncertainty in matters of authority, on account of the declaration of the 36th session of the Council of Basle (September 1439), which stated that the immaculate conception was a "pious doctrine, in conformity with the worship of the church, the catholic faith, right reason and

Holy Scripture."[82] By that point, however, the Council was in serious disagreement with the Pope, so that this decision was not treated as canonically binding. It is, however, clear that at least some later fifteenth-century theologians regarded this conciliar decision as magisterial, and appealed to it in their defense of this doctrine.[83]

There is growing agreement that the late medieval period saw considerable and widespread confusion develop within western Christendom concerning the official teaching of the church. Although there was a general consensus that it was necessary that there should be agreement – indeed, that no deviation could be permitted – concerning the fundamentals of the faith, as expressed in the Apostles' Creed,[84] it was also widely recognized that there was a need to distinguish these fundamental teachings of the church from the mere *opinions* of theologians, which could be debated and challenged in academic contexts. These "opinions" were tolerated, in that they did not pose a threat to the unity of the church. By the end of the fifteenth century, however, it was becoming increasingly clear that the distinction between "explicit catholic doctrine" and "theological opinion" was becoming confused, with wide uncertainty concerning to which of the two categories in question the increasingly wide range of theological views in circulation should be assigned.

The introduction of the new methodologies of the *via moderna*, particularly the logico-critical method, gave rise to a plethora of new theological ideas, which rapidly achieved a wide circulation in northern Europe. It was, however, far from clear what status these views enjoyed. Were they just the ideas of a few maverick theologians, or were they to be treated as catholic truth? In an age of confusion, it was inevitable that doctrinal plurality would flourish, and the distinction between "opinion" and "catholic truth" become increasingly blurred. Indeed, it could be argued that Luther's comprehensive theological protest against the church of his day was the consequence of an improper identification of the theological opinions of the *via moderna* concerning the justification of humanity before God (opinions which he came to regard as Pelagian) with the official teaching of the church. For Luther, it seemed that the entire church of his day had fallen into Pelagianism, and thus required doctrinal reformation as a matter of urgency – a judgment based upon the confusion of "opinion" and "dogma."

The uncertainty in the early decades of the sixteenth century in relation to the official teaching of the church on a number of matters is

particularly evident in relation to the doctrine of justification, thus lending some weight to Luther's misgivings. The Pelagian controversy had been brought to an end with the decisions of the Council of Carthage (418), which were subsequently clarified by the pronouncements of the Second Council of Orange (529).[85] Between this date and that of the sixth session of the Council of Trent (1546) – a period of more than a millennium – the church made no magisterial statement concerning the doctrine of justification. Furthermore, the decisions of Orange II were not available to the theologians of the Middle Ages: from the tenth century until the opening of the Council of Trent, the existence of the council, as well as its decisions, appear to have been unknown.[86] The theologians of the medieval period thus based their doctrines of justification upon the decisions of the Council of Carthage, which proved incapable of bearing the conceptual strain that came to be placed upon them. In a period of intense speculation, such as the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the orthodoxy of a new approach to the justification of humanity – such as that of the *via moderna* – had to be determined with reference to the Council of Carthage, which used terms such as "grace" in a less precise sense.[87] As a result, a wide spectrum of theologies of justification, all of which could be regarded as legitimated by the standards of the Council of Carthage, passed into general circulation. Had the pronouncements of Orange II been available, a much more restricted range of such theologies would have resulted.

Two examples may be given to illustrate this confusion. In 1510, a group of young Italian humanists, intensely concerned with ensuring their personal salvation, adopted two very different courses of action. One section of this group, led by Paolo Giustiniani, felt that the only hope for their assured salvation lay in a monastic life of extreme austerity and piety; the other, led by Gasparo Contarini, felt that it was – or must be – possible to be justified by remaining in secular life.[88] But which corresponded to the teaching of the church? In a period of doctrinal confusion, a definitive answer to the question was not immediately forthcoming. Both groups believed that their position was correct, and adopted lifestyles consistent with these beliefs. Yet these beliefs and their associated lifestyles were diametrically opposed. A second example is provided by Erasmus of Rotterdam, in his controversy with Martin Luther over the question of the freedom of the human will. In his *Hyperaspistes*, Erasmus appears to show himself as

being quite unaware of *any* official teaching of the church concerning the question of what people must do to be saved – a fact that must be taken into account when assessing the "catholicity" of Erasmus's views on justification.[89]

Such was the confusion concerning what constituted the official teaching of the *magisterium* and what was merely theological opinion that an astonishing diversity of views on the justification of humanity before God were in circulation at the opening of the sixteenth century. Those within the *via moderna* espoused a theology of justification that approached, although cannot actually be said to constitute, Pelagianism, while their counterparts within the *schola Augustiniana moderna* developed strongly – occasionally ferociously – anti-Pelagian theologies of justification. For the theologians of the *via antiqua*, still influential in the late medieval period, the formal cause of justification was the intrinsic denomination of a created habit of grace; for the theologians of the *via moderna* and *schola Augustiniana moderna*, the formal cause of justification was the extrinsic denomination of the divine acceptation. There was no agreement on the cause of the predestination of humanity, or upon the related question of the nature of the human and divine roles in justification. In short, an astonishingly broad spectrum of theologies of justification existed in the later medieval period, encompassing practically every option that had not been specifically condemned as heretical by the Council of Carthage. In the absence of any definitive magisterial pronouncement concerning which of these options (or even what range of options) could be considered authentically catholic, it was left to each theologian to reach his own decision in this matter. A self-perpetuating doctrinal pluralism was thus an inevitability.

This point is of importance for a number of reasons. First, it can be shown that Luther's theological breakthrough involved his abandoning one specific option within this broad spectrum of theologies of justification, and embracing another within that spectrum. In other words, Luther's initial position of 1513–14, and his subsequent position (probably arrived at in 1515), were both recognized contemporary theological opinions, regarded as legitimate by the doctrinal standards of the time. Luther does not appear to have appreciated this point, apparently confusing the theological opinions of the *via moderna* (which he would reject) with the official teaching of the catholic church (which he would also reject, apparently on the assumption that it had universally lapsed into a form of Pelagianism, such as that which Luther saw in the

teachings of the *via moderna*). Why, it may reasonably be asked, was Luther unaware of this point? And why, it must also be asked, should Luther's changed views on justification have led to a doctrinal Reformation? (If, indeed, they did lead to such a Reformation – the relationship between the *initia theologiae Lutheri* and the *initia Reformationis* is still far from clear at present.) After all, Luther's "new" views on justification were still well within the spectrum of contemporary catholic theological opinion. Even if Luther did not recognize this point, there must have been others at the time who did.

Second, when the Council of Trent met to define the catholic position on justification in relation to that of the Protestant churches, it found itself in the position of having to legitimize a wide range of theologies of justification, rather than legitimating or defining *one* specific theology. In fact, it is quite misleading to refer to "*the* Tridentine doctrine of justification," in that there is no such single doctrine, but a broadly defined range of such theologies (note the deliberate use of the plural). The Council of Trent was not concerned with resolving the theological disputes between the *via antiqua* and *via moderna*, nor between Thomists or Scotists, but was primarily charged with the task of drawing a clear line of demarcation between catholic and Protestant teachings. In effect, Trent was therefore obliged to acknowledge and endorse the doctrinal pluralism of the late medieval period.

Although a similar doctrinal diversity and confusion may be demonstrated in the spheres of theology other than the doctrine of justification, this particular doctrine is clearly of outstanding importance in relation to this present study. There is still every reason to suggest that the theological issue over which the Lutheran Reformation began was that of justification, and the doctrinal diversity within the late medieval church in relation to this doctrine, when linked to the apparent inability to distinguish catholic dogma from theological opinion, may be regarded as the backdrop to Luther's reforming vocation. Although, as will be emphasized later in this chapter, it is improper to extrapolate from Luther's personal theological concerns to those of the Reformation as a whole, it is nevertheless significant that the intellectual origins of the Lutheran Reformation appear to be linked with the doctrinal pluralism of the later Middle Ages.

Briefly stated, then, the later medieval period may be regarded as characterized by a twofold crisis of authority. First, there was an evident lack of clarity concerning the nature, location, and exercise of

theological authority at a time when rapid intellectual development led to considerable diversification of theological opinions, and confusion concerning the precise status of these opinions. The views of the Reformers initially appear to have paralleled views entertained elsewhere in the period, and thus not to have attracted attention until the situation had developed to a point at which forcible suppression of their views was necessary. Second, it is clear that the church, whether through inability or disinclination, did not move to suppress the views of the Reformers during the period when such suppression was a real possibility. The provincial and diocesan synods, established by the Fourth Lateran Council as the means of enforcing theological orthodoxy, appear to have failed to exercise such authority when it was most required.

Forerunners of the Reformation

The search for the intellectual origins of the Reformation has traditionally been conducted within the framework of "Forerunners of the Reformation." This tendency may be traced back to the work of Karl Heinrich Ullmann, who identified Johannes Pupper of Goch, Johannes Ruchrat of Wesel, and Wessel Gansfort as chief among such "Forerunners."[90] Inevitably, Ullmann's understanding of the nature of the Reformation was heavily influenced by his Lutheran presuppositions. The search for such "Forerunners" has, in fact, met with little success.[91] There has, for example, been a tendency to treat the Reformation as a homogeneous phenomenon, essentially defined by Luther's doctrine of justification. "Forerunners of the Reformation" are thus categorized as medieval thinkers who anticipated one or more determinative aspects of Luther's theology of justification.[92] It is, however, quite unacceptable to limit such an inquiry in this way. In particular, two objections may be made. First, why should the inquiry be restricted to Luther's *doctrine of justification*? Second, why should the inquiry be restricted to Luther? The relation between the *initia theologiae Lutheri* and the *initia Reformationis* is now appreciated to be of such complexity that it is quite improper to regard Luther's personal theological preoccupations as identical with, or even coterminous with, those of the Lutheran Reformation as a whole.[93] Nor can the quest for the intellectual origins of the Reformation be limited to Luther, when there is such an

abundance of evidence that Zwingli's reformation at Zurich owed its historical and theological origins to quite different currents of thought.

It is quite clear that the search for "Forerunners of the Reformation" owed its origins to confessional and essentially *polemical*, rather than scholarly, considerations. Far from representing an objective exercise in intellectual history, the question of forerunners has been conceived in terms of demonstrating that "Lutheran" ideas were either the revival of existing heresies or the repristination of authentic trends in late medieval theology. The former approach underlies much of the early catholic critique of Luther, particularly within France. In condemning as heretical or heterodox Luther's early theological theses in the sixteenth century, the University of Paris attempted to establish the essential continuity between earlier heresies and the ideas now being expounded by Luther. Luther's ideas were thus not to be regarded as original, but were essentially the republication of older heresies. Thus Luther was a Hussite in his theology of contrition, a Wycliffite in his doctrine of confession, and a Manichean in his theology of grace and free will.[94] According to the University of Paris, there were "Forerunners of the Reformation" only in the sense that the Reformation represented a reappearance of older heresies: the polemical rhetorical device of *reductio ad haeresim* was sufficient to establish the heretical spiritual lineage of the movement.

Lutheran apologists, on the other hand, attempted to establish continuity between the Reformation and the *testes veritatis* – the authentic Christian tradition, which had survived in the medieval period, despite the corruptions of scholasticism.[95] The charge to which the Lutheran Reformers were particularly sensitive was that of doctrinal innovation, and the most persuasive means of countering this charge was to demonstrate the continuity of the theology of the Reformers with that of the patristic era via the representatives of the *testes veritatis* in the medieval period. The most significant exposition of this continuity was Flacius Illyricus's *Ecclesiastica Historia secundum singulas centurias*, better known simply as the *Magdeburg Centuries*.[96] Based on Flacius's earlier work *Catalogus testium veritatis*,[97] the *Centuries* developed its method in an increasingly sophisticated direction. Whereas the *Catalogus* was primarily concerned with identifying those who had opposed papal claims or had suffered as a result of them in the past, the *Centuries* adopted a different approach by emphasizing the positive criterion of theological continuity between the Reformers and their forerunners

with such effect that it was dubbed *pestilentissimum opus* by the opponents of the Reformation. In that it was the Luther Reformation that was subjected to the most persistent and penetrating critique by contemporary catholic academics, it was inevitable that the question of the theological antecedents of the Reformation should be discussed solely with reference to it, rather than to the Reformed church. Catholic anti-Reformation polemic appears to have focused on Luther, rather than on Zwingli or the Rhineland reformers of the 1520s.

The historian cannot, however, be satisfied with any such polemical foundation or criterion of the notion of "Forerunners of the Reformation," whether this is interpreted negatively (that is, the Lutheran Reformation as the revitalization of older heresies) or positively (that is, the Lutheran Reformation as the restitution of the *testes veritatis*). There has been a most regrettable tendency, undoubtedly reflecting both the nationality and the confessional bias of scholars working in the field, to deal with the question of "Forerunners of the Reformation" solely in terms of the German Lutheran Reformation. The question of the origins of the leading ideas associated with the Reformed church cannot be excluded from this analysis. In fact, it could be argued that the severe limitations of the thesis of the "Forerunner" are largely due to its historical origins as a sixteenth-century polemical device in the disputes over the "catholicity" of the Lutheran Reformation. Modern scholarship, not wishing to be impeded by such considerations, is at liberty either to modify the concept, or to abandon it altogether. The polemical intentions of the thesis of the "Forerunner," as stated in its original form, make it unsuitable for the purposes of this study. It will, however, be clear that this does not call into question, still less invalidate, the basic notion of a degree of fundamental theological continuity between the Reformation and the late medieval period: it simply means that this thesis cannot be investigated on the basis of such questionable sixteenth-century presuppositions. In particular, it is no longer possible to overlook the enormously significant question of the intellectual origins of the Reformed church, which was generally overlooked on account of the polemical intentions of both the critics and defenders of early Lutheranism. It is on the basis of considerations such as these that the concept of the "Forerunners" must be recognized to require modification.

The frequent linkage proposed within the earlier literature between "medieval heresies" and "Forerunners of the Reformation" requires

much closer examination. It is manifestly obvious that the term "heresy" has changed its meaning over the years, causing no small difficulties for those who would seek to determine its essence or structure. The etymology of the term is not especially helpful;[98] the term has come to have developed associations which, though clearly related to its original meaning, incorporate additional nuances. Strictly speaking, the use of the term "heresy" in a *theological* sense must be restricted to the patristic period. The term was extensively used throughout the Middle Ages with overtones that distance the medieval usage of the term from its original associations. The case against the continuing use of the term "heresy" to designate religious movements in the Middle Ages was first made in 1935 by Herbert Grundmann, who argued that the notion was defined from an inquisitional, rather than theological, perspective.[99] "Heresy" was defined in terms of challenges posed to the authority of the church, from the perspective of those who were thus challenged.

A purely historical account of the notion of heresy in the Middle Ages is thus obliged to define orthodoxy in terms of papal teaching, and heresy in terms of dissent from such teaching.[100] Heresy increasingly became a juridical notion.[101] Where the patristic period conceived heresy in terms of a deviation from the catholic faith, the Jurists of the twelfth and thirteenth century succeeded in redefining the notion in terms of the rejection of ecclesiastical authority, especially papal authority. As Robert Moore has argued, the extension of the category of heresy was an important instrument of social control.[102] The medieval redefinition of heresy locates its essence in challenging papal power, rather than in deviating from Christian orthodoxy. Heresy became the means by which a society subsumed its endemic tensions under a notionally religious category. It ceased to be a theological notion, and was now defined legally or sociologically.[103]

There is thus no theological contradiction involved in the Reformation's insistence that many of those stigmatized as "heretics" by the medieval church were, in fact, orthodox Christians. Nor could any posited continuity between, for example, Luther and a medieval "heretic" be taken as a *prima facie* indication of heterodoxy on Luther's part, precisely because of the manner in which the Middle Ages chose to construe the notion of heresy in a sociological rather than theological manner. Yet our increased awareness of the sociological dimensions of medieval heresy raises a fundamental problem for the traditional

conception of the "Forerunner of the Reformation" on account of the communal dimensions of the concept. As Grundmann stressed, heresy is to be understood as a *Lebensform* rather than as a set of abstract ideas.[104] These heresies lacked a "definite heretical doctrine" as a point of nucleation and a means of distinguishing them from those around them; the boundaries were thus social, rather than ideational.

If this understanding of the medieval heresies to which the Reformation is alleged to be linked is conceded, the notion that Luther allied himself to certain individual thinkers of earlier generations becomes problematic. The issue concerns communities and intellectual "movements" (*Bewegungen*), in Grundmann's nuanced sense of the term, rather than the isolated ideas of individuals. The debate must therefore be concerned with how Luther and others relate to the historical aftermath of such movements, and ought, as far as possible, to be conducted on historical rather than confessional criteria. There is no longer any polemical or apologetic need to demonstrate that there exist "Forerunners" of either Lutheran or Reformed ideas; the real issue is the extent of continuity and the nature of discontinuity between the ideas and those of the later Middle Ages. It is becoming increasingly clear that, if there exist "Forerunners of the Reformation," these are not to be identified with specific individuals within the late medieval church, but with *trends within the late medieval church as a whole*.

It was the methodological and doctrinal pluralism of the later Middle Ages that gave birth to both the German and Swiss Reformations, in that the distinctive ideas associated with the Reformation in its various manifestations arose within the vortex of late medieval religious thought. The diversity of opinion concerning the sources and methods of theological speculation, the confusion concerning the *locus* of authority within the church, and other factors such as those already noted in this chapter, combined to create a significant degree of theological instability in northern Europe, which seems to have gone largely unnoticed in Italy. From this matrix would emerge the ideas and methods that would shape the intellectual foundations of the Reformation, and rupture the unity of the European church. The present study is conceived as an investigation into the continuities and discontinuities between the thought of the Reformation *as a whole* and that of the later medieval period, in an attempt to cast light upon both the intellectual origins and character of this movement, which has exercised so great an influence over the shaping of modern Europe.

2

Humanism and the Reformation

It is now becoming increasingly clear that the intellectual environment of the early sixteenth century is sufficiently complex to inhibit simplistic generalizations concerning the precise relationship between humanism and scholasticism, or humanism and the Reformation.[1] In particular, the tendency of certain older scholars to identify "humanism" with the personal interests, concerns, and beliefs of Erasmus of Rotterdam is now regarded as both improper and misleading. This chapter is concerned with the identification of the interests and methods of the humanists, in order to cast light upon the all-important relationship between humanism and the Reformation.

Humanism: The Problem of Definition

There is no doubt that, by the opening of the sixteenth century, humanism was a well-established transnational movement, with a strong sense of its identity. In a careful study of the development of the group identity of German humanists over the period 1450–1530, Eckhard Bernstein points to the deliberate fostering of a sense of identity and purpose, almost comparable to the idea of a religious vocation.[2] Humanists saw themselves as a new "lay order," with the potential to transform European culture, and realized the importance of consolidating the social and intellectual cohesion of the movement. A number of strategies were devised with this objective in mind – for example, the cultivation of Latin or Greek names,[3] the emphasis upon Latin as the *lingua franca* of the new republic of letters, the founding of sodalities, the elevation of the concept of friendship, and the excoriation of those seen as opponents of the movement (perhaps most notably scholastic

theologians). In such ways, humanists transformed their perceived status within western culture from being outsiders to insiders, in turn marginalizing those who they disliked through a rhetoric of scorn.

Yet the creation of social cohesion presupposes at least some degree of shared values and ideas. So what are the common features of this movement? What unites individual humanists into a greater movement, transcending individuals and national boundaries? To answer this question, we must trace the movement back to its origins in Italy, and attempt to identify its distinctive themes. At least four views of the nature and aims of the humanism of Italian Renaissance gained some support in the twentieth century.[4] First, there is the view based upon the writings of Jacob Burckhardt, which regards the Renaissance as marking the birth of the modern consciousness: humanists may therefore be viewed as the advocates of the individualism, secularism, and moral autonomy that characterized the Enlightenment worldview to which Burckhardt was heir.[5] Second, the rival view based upon the writings of Giuseppe Tofannin views Italian humanists as exponents of an authentically Christian culture, in the face of a challenge from the growth of both heterodoxy and paganism (particularly the form found within the "Ciceronianism" so favored by many humanist writers).[6] Third, there is the view based upon the works of Hans Baron, according to which Florentine humanists were essentially exponents of republicanism, who studied the classics in order to benefit from their political and moral insights.[7] Fourth, Paul Oskar Kristeller offered a more nuanced and sensitive account of humanism, which envisages the movement as essentially cultural and educational, primarily concerned with written and spoken eloquence, and only secondarily concerned with matters of philosophy and politics.[8] In fact, the Italian Renaissance is such a multifaceted phenomenon that most generalizations concerning its essence are prone to reductionist tendencies. For reasons that will be outlined below, there are excellent grounds for preferring Kristeller's view.

According to Baron, humanism prior to 1400 was still an essentially medieval movement. The emancipation of humanism from this medieval context took place within Florence, primarily through the influence of Leonardo Bruni. A new sense of historical location and perspective developed within the city, with republican Florence being regarded as the heir of the classic Roman tradition. A new appreciation of Cicero appears to have developed more or less simultaneously, reflecting the

new interest in the political ideas of the Roman republic.[9] But, as others have pointed out, the Florentine humanism of the period appeared to be characterized more by its preoccupation with rhetoric than with the positive defense of republican civil ideals.[10] Indeed, Cicero appears to have been studied by the humanists of the *Quattrocento* primarily as an orator, rather than as a political thinker.

The attractiveness of Kristeller's view of humanism lies in the fact that it is able to account for at least a substantial amount of the remarkable diversity of outlooks evident within the Renaissance. The humanists do not appear to have adopted a coherent position on matters of substance: thus both Burckhardt and Tofannin can point to strands within Renaissance thought that support their very different approaches to the movement. Nor was the Renaissance characterized by a coherent philosophical outlook, which distinguished it from that of scholasticism. Although it is unquestionably true that the period witnessed a wide and significant revival of various forms of Platonism,[11] the fact remains that a significant number of humanists consciously adopted various forms of Aristotelianism, not least on account of its perceived importance in the fields of ethics and logic.[12] lndeed, there are excellent reasons for suggesting that the rise of scholasticism within Reformed theology in the 1560s is ultimately due to the influence of Paduan Renaissance Aristotelianism. Ermolao Barbaro's lectures on the *Nicomachean Ethics*, delivered during the academic year 1474–5 at Padua, illustrate the attraction that Aristotle's ethics exercised over many late Renaissance thinkers.[13] Similarly, the *Heptadogma* of Robert Goulet – basically an introduction to the curriculum at the university of Paris in the late Renaissance – indicates the importance of Aristotle in relation to logic.[14] Perhaps most significantly, there appears to have been a degree of indifference to such matters within the Renaissance: of the published works dating from this period, the relatively small number devoted to philosophical or political discussions – often characterized by their amateurishness – are far outnumbered by those devoted to the "pursuit of eloquence." It seems that the humanists saw themselves primarily as men of letters, concerned with modeling and commending written and spoken eloquence.[15]

This point may be illustrated from the inaugural orations of Bartolommeo della Fonte (1446–1513), a minor humanist and professor of poetry and oratory at the university of Florence in the penultimate

decade of the *Quattrocento*.[16] In his *Oratio in laudem oratoriae facultatis*, delivered at Florence on November 7, 1481 as a prelude to the study of Cicero's *Orationes*, della Fonte argues that the characteristic mark of humanity, distinguishing it from the animals, is the human capacity to express thoughts in words. Rhetoric is thus the discipline that brings out what is distinctive and fundamental to humanity, both enhancing the distinction between humanity and other creatures on the one hand, and on the other, allowing more cultured – and hence *humane* – people to be distinguished from their uncultured neighbors.[17] That this view of humanism embraces both pagan and Christian is evident from della Fonte's assertion that the apostle Paul, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine were not merely men of outstanding piety, but also individuals who excelled in the elegance of their speech and writing (*dicendi quoque ac scribendi elegantia praestiterunt*).[18] If della Fonte is typical of its values, humanism can thus essentially be conceived as a cultural and educational program, based upon written and spoken eloquence, to which people of any religious, political, or philosophical persuasion may subscribe without compromising their convictions. It is perhaps on account of the fact that humanism did not embrace any specific opinions on any of these matters, confining itself instead to the pursuit of eloquence, that the movement made such deep inroads into all sections of Italian society in the period of the Renaissance.

A further point that should be noted is the alleged tension between northern European and Italian humanism. Although an earlier generation of historians felt able to construct a model of European humanism that contrasted a Christian humanism north of the Alps with an essentially profane and secular humanism in Italy, modern scholarship has called this model into question. While it is clear that some contemporary northern European humanists recognized a tension between their own views and those of certain Italian humanists, this serves merely to confirm the fundamental diversity of Renaissance humanism. The profane and the Christian existed side by side in the Renaissance, both laying claim to be "humanist."

The importance of Kristeller's definition of humanism lies in the fact that it still permits us to regard humanism as a coherent movement, with certain minimal characteristics, while simultaneously recognizing that its complex network of intellectual interests defies simplistic

reduction in terms of an underlying philosophical unity. Without the recognition of the polymorphism of the movement, it is quite possible that the term "humanism" would cease to function as a meaningful designation in intellectual history. In the Renaissance a *humanista* was a professional teacher of the *studia humanitatis*, and the temptation to impose the modern secular nuances of the term upon its Renaissance equivalent must be resisted. Far too many modern students tend to approach the question of the relation between humanism and the Reformation on the basis of the assumption that humanists were predisposed *against* Christianity in general, and the catholic church in particular.

Although it is clear that Renaissance humanism was characterized by no distinctive philosophical or ideological stance, the fact remains that, virtually without exception, the humanists were Christians who saw themselves as operating within the context of the life and thought of the church. There has been an increasing reaction against the Enlightenment tendency, still evident in some quarters, to regard the humanists as precursors of the Enlightenment critique of religion. The humanist were regarded by the Enlightenment as prophets of the free human spirit, working toward their emancipation from the narrow confine of the world of medieval religion, in much the same way as the Reformation was to be regarded as primarily concerning the right to exercise unrestricted private judgment.[19] Perhaps the most important consideration leading to the discrediting of this view of humanism concerns the obsession of certain humanists with magic and the cabala.[20] As the interest (or obsession, as some scholars would have it) in the medieval Faust legend indicates,[21] many humanists had more in common with the spirit of Romanticism than with the sober rationalism of the Enlightenment.[22] Furthermore, successive studies of Pico della Mirandola,[23] Lorenzo Valla,[24] and Desiderius Erasmus[25] – to name but a few of the more important figures associated with the movement – have stressed the continuity of humanism with the medieval catholic spiritual tradition, rather than viewing it as a precursor of rationalism. Humanism was an important element in the flux of late medieval religious life and thought, being particularly influential among the intellectual elite, and thus inevitably possessing a significant potential influence upon late medieval piety, religion, and theology. The crucial question with which the historian is particularly concerned is the identification of the nature and extent of such influence.

A further point that should be noted is the cosmopolitan character of humanism. Although various movements that could conceivably be designated as "proto-humanist" may be identified in fifteenth-century northern Europe,[26] it seems that the development of northern European humanism was both stimulated and informed by the diffusion of the ideals of the Italian Renaissance.[27] The early flirtations with Italian humanism in the middle of the fourteenth century at the Prague court of Charles IV certainly fit this pattern, although this is generally regarded as an isolated incident, which had little impact elsewhere in the region. For most scholars, the origins of German humanism are to be traced to 1452, with the publication of Albrecht von Eyb's *Tractatus de speciositate puellulae*.[28]

Three main channels of diffusion have been identified.[29] The first was through the exchange of persons between northern Europe and Renaissance Italy. Thus northern European students might study at Italian universities before returning to assume influential teaching positions in northern universities. The second was through the extensive foreign correspondence of the Italian humanists, the full extent of which is only gradually becoming apparent through the process of cataloging. The third was through the dissemination of manuscripts, and particularly through printed works. Although printing was a German invention, many of the more important late fifteenth-century presses were situated in northern Italy.

The strongly cosmopolitan aura of humanism is, of course, particularly well instanced in the case of Erasmus, who famously regarded himself as a citizen of the Latin-speaking world,[30] and treated languages other than Latin with marked disdain.[31] His momentary lapse into his native Dutch on his deathbed should not be permitted to obscure the fact that Erasmus, unlike many strongly nationalist humanists, regarded national boundaries and languages as impediments in the path of humanist ideals in general, and the advance of civilization in particular.[32] The strongly national overtones associated with local humanist circles such as that to which Zwingli belonged contrast strongly with Erasmus's studied indifference to local cultures and political situations.[33] Erasmus had no time for the nationalist pride evident in Vadian's dedicator poem to Glarean's hexameters in praise of Switzerland, in which he asserts that the intellectual minority of Switzerland has been brought to an end through the efforts of Glarean and Myconius, the muses of Apollo now having climbed the Swiss Alps.[34]

Characteristic Features of Northern European Humanism

In dealing with the question of the intellectual origins of the European Reformation, we are primarily concerned with the characteristic ideals, methods, and presuppositions of northern European humanism. Broadly speaking, three quite distinct, although related, such characteristics may be identified. These are a literary or cultural program, directed toward the ideal of *bonae litterae*; a religious program directed toward the ideal of *Christianismus renascens*; and a political program, primarily directed toward the establishment of peace in Europe.

The importance of a shared sense of identity to the development of northern European humanism must be emphasized. As Eckhard Bernstein has pointed out, "the gradual emergence of the humanists as a self-confident educational and literary elite and a major intellectual force did not happen by some magic working of the *Zeitgeist*, but was the result of conscious and well-thought-out strategies, policies and professional moves."[35] The way in which Renaissance humanism developed its group identity has still not been explored in depth;[36] nevertheless, it is clear that the humanist sodalities played a critical role in consolidating the humanist sense of self-identity. The manner in which the Roman Academy – a humanist sodality on a rather grander scale – defined itself with reference to essentially Ciceronian linguistic and ideological criteria illustrates the way in which humanist were able to cultivate a strong sense of group identity, while at the same time demarcating themselves from those they judged to be "outsiders."[37] Part of the process of crystallization of identity involved heightening the tension between humanists and other groups, especially scholastic theologians and philosophers, apparently in the belief that this process encouraged humanist unity and commitment.[38] The widespread use of published works of satire within humanist writings served both to discredit the "obscure people" regarded as opponents by humanists, as well as fostering the impression that humanism was a credible alternative to those movements and individuals being criticized.[39]

It is also significant that Erasmus's *Enchiridion Militis Christiani* fosters a quasi-religious understanding of the role of the lay intellectual or reader of Scripture, both in the reform of the church and in the general government of its affairs. If Erasmus's vision of the learned and pious

layperson is set against the backdrop of the debate over monastic reforms of the period,[40] it is clear that his vision for the renewal of the church is linked with the reconceptualization of both the religious order and the religious life, involving seeing the faithful literate lay person as having a distinctive religious vocation. The notion of humanism as a "lay order" can be found in the writings of Mutianus Rufus (Konrad Mutian), a central figure in Erfurt humanist circles in the first two decades of the sixteenth century.[41]

The rise of classical scholarship is one of the most distinctive features of the Italian Renaissance, and its influence upon northern European humanism, such as that of Erasmus, is beyond dispute.[42] lt must, of course, be appreciated that the intense study of ancient literature and philology was not generally seen as an end in itself, but as a means toward the attainment of eloquence, both written and spoken. The negative attitude adopted toward the vernacular by many humanists, such as Erasmus, reflected their conviction that *eloquentia* could only be achieved through the medium of Ciceronian Latin. The humanist emphasis on the significance of language is, however, of greater importance than might at first be thought. The new interest in classical rhetorical theory and sources, such as Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* and Cicero's *Topica*, was linked with an emphasis upon the unique and particular elements of literature and history – the irreducible particularity of human reality was widely recognized as being more suited to historical description, rather than logical analysis.[43] Thus the New Testament was read, not as the basis of an intellectually comprehensive and logically consistent theological system, but as the record of the early Christian experience given in a specific literary and historical form.

Those who see the origins of modern historicism as lying in the Renaissance period have good reason for doing so.[44] The early humanist concern with the *text* of the New Testament, particularly evident with Valla, is ultimately an expression of the conviction that this text may, through appropriate literary and historical analysis, yield moral and doctrinal insights of importance to the specific historical situation of the interpreter. Although many of the humanists commended the *eloquentia* of the New Testament, particularly the Pauline writings, it is clear that this text was generally recognized as an intellectually modest source incapable of bearing the dialectical weight imposed upon it through the theological speculation of the schoolmen.

The appeal to the New Testament and the fathers[45] as the sources of a reformed and renewed church was an appeal to return *ad fontes*. This celebrated slogan must not be misunderstood: the New Testament, and writers such as Vergil and Galen, had been known for centuries – what was new was not so much these sources themselves, as both the method by and the spirit in which they were approached. Commentaries and glosses were to be bypassed, in order to engage directly with the text itself – whether the text in question was the Justinian *Pandects* or the New Testament. The importance of this point will be further emphasized in chapter 4. The new spirit in which these classical sources were read must not be overlooked. Vergil was read with the idea of imitating Aeneas by setting out by sea, to voyage to distant lands (it need hardly be added that the discovery of the Americas in the final decade of the fifteenth century made a deep impression upon the contemporary European consciousness).[46] Galen was read with the idea of carrying out experiments by which medical and scientific knowledge might be confirmed and enlarged. The New Testament was read with the idea of encountering the risen Christ (*Christus renascens*) through faith, and recapturing the vitality of the experience of the early church.[47] The slogan *ad fontes* was more than simply a call to return to ancient sources – it was a call to return to the essential realities of human existence as reported in these literary sources. The new literary and philological techniques enabled readers to return to and reinterpret their own experience *e fontibus*. Far from being merely a purely literary or cultural program, the recall *ad fontes* was also the summons to a search for experience and meaning, which recognized in classical sources the means toward this end. Literary and philological techniques allowed the reader to break out of the literary situation of these works, and encounter something deeper. For the Reformers, the new techniques allowed the reader to break out of the specific historical situation of the New Testament writings, and hear in them nothing other than the Word of God.

The humanist literary program encapsulated in the slogan *ad fontes* has immediate and obvious affinities with the theological concerns of the Reformation. Reformer and humanist alike wished Christian doctrine and practice to be established *e fontibus*, upon the basis of the New Testament and the fathers, rather than on medieval biblical glosses or commentaries, or the complex matrix of presuppositions underlying scholastic theology. Particularly in the early phase of the Reformation, there appears to have been a "productive misunderstanding" between

humanists and Reformers, with the former apparently assuming that the latter were committed to essentially the same program as themselves.[48] It is easy to see how this impression could arise. Both humanist and Reformer had serious misgivings concerning scholastic theology; both wished to return to the Bible, particularly the New Testament, as the source of Christian doctrine; both greatly valued the fathers as witnesses to the vitality and character of early Christianity. This appeared to indicate that both movements possessed a common theological program, and many at the time appear to have assumed that this was the case. It was the humanists who, by their support for Luther in the period 1518–21, transformed a minor controversy within the theological faculty of the University of Wittenberg into a major controversy with ramifications for both church and society. What was initially a purely local controversy was, through the cosmopolitan public agitation of its humanist observers, debated by intellectuals throughout much of Europe. Nevertheless, the fact remains that superficial similarities between the reforming programs of the humanists and the early evangelicals served only to conceal profound differences.

Both humanists and Reformers were hostile toward scholastic theology.[49] The humanists objected to the scholastic emphasis upon abstract ideas, dislocated and detached from their living historical contexts, which seemed to them to represent an unhealthy obsession with universal and religious truths. Humanist writers preferred to deal with specific concrete historical situations. Furthermore, the degenerate Latin and arcane terminology employed by the schoolmen in their dialectical disputations were the subject of widespread derision within the humanist movement. For the humanists, there was no reason whatsoever why matters of ethics or theology could not be expressed eloquently and simply. For the Reformers, particularly Luther, the scholastics were not to be criticized on account of their style or vocabulary, but on account of the theology for which these were but secondary vehicles. A reformation of doctrine, rather than of style or vocabulary, was the real issue at stake.

Similarly, the humanists regarded Scripture, and particularly the New Testament, as the *fons et origo* of Christianity, valuing it both on account of its antiquity and its literary significance. For Erasmus, the importance of the New Testament relates to the teaching of Jesus as the *lex Christi*, so that the New Testament is to be regarded as the primary instrument in a religiously educative and formative process. It was, however, only

one of several such sources, and could not be regarded as the sole authoritative source of doctrine and ethics. For many of the reformers, particularly Luther, Scripture was the sole means by which access might be had to the Word of God. The slogan *sola scriptura* was thus interpreted in an exclusive sense, meaning that Scripture alone was to be regarded as the sole source of Christian truth.[50] This left open, of course, the question of the manner in which this text was to be interpreted, and particularly the insights concerning the role of nature and conscience. Nevertheless, these issues were held to be determined on biblical grounds, rather than on the basis of extrabiblical considerations.

Finally, the humanists valued the fathers as representatives and exponents of a simple and comprehensible form of Christianity, more authentic than the debased faith that passed itself off as Christianity in the late medieval period. The authority of the fathers was seen to be vested in both their antiquity and their eloquence, rather than in their theological opinions.[51] For the Reformers, however, the fathers were to be valued as expositors of Scripture, representing forms of Christianity that had since become corrupted and distorted through the questionable presuppositions and methods of medival theologians.[52] For Luther, Augustine was to be regarded as pre-eminent among the fathers on account of his theological opinions. For the humanists, Augustine could not be singled out in this manner: indeed, for Erasmus, it was Jerome who was *summus theologus*.[53]

The question of whether a patristic writer's importance was determined by his theology, or his eloquence and scholarship, served to distinguish humanist and Reformer, although this point was not fully appreciated in the heady days of the early Reformation. Later chapters will consider the importance of humanist literary scholarship and techniques in relation to theological sources and methods. Attention should now turn to the interaction of humanism and the two main elements of the Reformation.

Humanism and the Origins of the Reformed Church

In recent years, there has been a growing tendency among scholars of the Swiss Reformation to recognize the political origins of the Reformed church in the so-called "First Zurich Disputation" of January 29, 1523.[54]

The *sola scriptura* principle was introduced in Zurich in the late autumn of 1520, making Scripture the sole basis of public preaching. It proved to be a cause for popular dissension. Zwingli's attacks of 1522 on clerical celibacy and the intercession of the saints – both of which challenged the authority of the church on the basis of Scripture – aroused considerable public feeling, to which the Zurich city council was obliged to respond. In the disputation (which the city council appears to have regarded as a purely judicial proceeding, designed to establish whether Zwingli had conformed to earlier decisions of that council),[55] the *sola scriptura* principle was reaffirmed, and the legality of Zwingli's preaching upheld. The disputation proved to be the prototype of a whole series of similar disputations throughout the period 1523–36, defining the characteristics of the Reformed church.[56]

Although it must be emphasized that the disputation merely confirmed the earlier decision of the city council to encourage preaching based upon Scripture alone, the outcome of the disputation proved to have considerable impact upon the nascent Reformation in Switzerland and south Germany, in that the *sola scriptura* principle quickly became accepted as normative, and as a distinguishing feature of the emerging evangelical movement in the region.[57] Zwingli had turned an academic disputation into an occasion of public decision and, as events would show, into a formidable weapon for reformation.

Although it is possible to argue that the city council was actually strengthening its own position (in that it was the council, rather than Scripture itself, that was to be recognized as the arbiter of what was formally consistent with Scripture), the decision was widely regarded as establishing the theological basis of the emerging Reformed church, and acting as a criterion of demarcation between evangelical and catholic – or, to use the language of the Reformed tradition, between reformed and unreformed – forms of Christianity.

This discussion, however, is primarily concerned with the intellectual origins of the Reformed church, rather than the means by which its theological program came to be legitimized and propagated – in other words, with the question of *how* the thinkers of the early Reformed church came to hold their distinctive ideas, rather than the political means by which these were institutionalized and propagated. It is therefore necessary to consider the background of its leading figures, an attempt to assess the influence of humanism upon their intellectual development.

The origins of the Reformed church are inextricably interlocked with the emergence of a distinctively Swiss group of humanists, characterized by a vision for the future of the church that envisaged reform primarily as a reformation of life and morals.[58] Doctrinal reform was not regarded as necessary or important; the central issues concerned the revitalization of the vision of the church, and a realignment of its structures and morality with those envisaged by the New Testament – a vision of reform that can be seen in Zwingli's early sermons at Zurich during the year 1519.

It is now clear that the second decade of the sixteenth century witnessed the emergence of a distinctively Swiss form of humanism that may be contrasted with the cosmopolitanism of Erasmus.[59] The efforts of Vadian in Vienna, Glarean in Paris, Myconius and Xylotectus in Lucerne, and Zwingli in Einsiedeln during this period were not primarily concerned with the creation of a cosmopolitan republic of letters, but with establishing the literary and cultural identity of the Swiss nation at a time of political uncertainty.[60] The importance of the University of Vienna in relation to this circle of Swiss humanists should be noted.[61] Through the university reforms introduced by Heinrich von Langenstein in 1386, Vienna had become a center for the *via moderna*. The career of Nicholas Kampf of Strasbourg (c.1415–97) may be taken as an excellent illustration of the complexity of the intellectual currents flowing in the University of Vienna in the fifteenth century. Kampf's time at Vienna (1437–9) is generally agreed to antedate the rise of humanism in the university, traditionally dated around 1450.[62] By the final decade of the fifteenth century, the confrontation between humanism and scholasticism so characteristic of many late medieval universities at this juncture had also become a major issue at Vienna.

The arrival of Konrad Celtis during the final years of the century catalyzed this confrontation still further, and led to Vienna becoming increasingly recognized as a center for humanist studies.[63] In the first two decades of the sixteenth century, Vienna was the most sought-after university in eastern Europe.[64] The arrival of Zwingli as a student at Vienna in 1498 coincided with that of Celtis: although little is known of Zwingli's interests and concerns at that time,[65] it is significant that he became associated with a humanist circle with strong links with the university.[66] One of the leading figures within this circle was Joachim Vadian, who was highly active in university life in Vienna throughout the period 1501–18.[67]

The leading features of Swiss humanism in the first two decades of the sixteenth century broadly parallel those of northern European humanism in general,[68] although with strongly nationalist overtones reflecting a growing conviction of the need to forge a distinct national identity in the face of the political upheavals then destabilizing the region. The geographical location of Switzerland facilitated contact with both Italian and northern European intellectual movements, and these contacts were further strengthened by the tendency, particularly evident in the final decade of the fifteenth century, of Swiss students to study abroad. Major printing presses were established in leading Swiss cities (such as those of Froben, the brothers Amerbach, and Cratander in Basle and Froschauer in Zurich), thus facilitating the establishment of a *respublica litteraria* in the region.[69] The same vision of *Christianismus renascens* that so excited other northern European humanists was an essential aspect of the Swiss movement.[70]

Vadian's first major religious work was his commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, in which he contrasted the vitality of the early church with the stagnation being experienced within the contemporary church, as well as breaking new ground in literary analysis by drawing on classical geographical sources (such as the Ulm edition of Ptolomy's *Geographia*) in the course of his exposition of his text.[71] The strong political cast of the Swiss humanist movement was particularly evident in the widespread popular dissatisfaction with the role forced upon Switzerland by its more powerful neighbors during the Franco-Italian war. Zwingli's writings from his early Glarus period indicate his hostile reaction to this war,[72] which is echoed in contemporary humanist accounts of its brutalities.[73] One of the more significant and distinctive features of Swiss humanism during the critical period 1516–19 is the growing interest in pacifism and the establishment of a distinct Swiss national identity, which is particularly evident in Myconius's significantly titled dialog *Philirenus* (1519).[74]

The growing interest in humanism on the part of Swiss students has been carefully documented by Hans Trümpy, in a study of the universities attended by students from Glarus in the period 1475–1520.[75] Before 1507, such students tended to study at German universities, such as Freiburg and Heidelberg.[76] During the period during which Swiss humanism began to flourish – usually considered to be 1507–21 – a marked shift is evident: of the 28 Swiss students studied by Trümpy, all but three attended universities by then established as centers of

humanism. Thus four studied at Vienna; 12 studied at Basle, the center of a humanist circle including Heinrich Lupulus (Wölfli), Melchior Volmar, Jakob Fullonius (Walker), Valerius Anshelm, Michael Rubellus (Röttli), and Thomas Wyttenbach, which gained an international reputation among humanists, such as Erasmus.[77] Eight studied at Glarean's academy in Paris, dedicated to the propagation of humanist ideals.[78] (The trauma of the 1520s, when the Turks stood at the gates of Vienna, effectively bringing the work of that university to an end, and the political disturbances at Basle that reduced the student enrollment there from 60 in 1521 to one in 1528, and none at all in 1529, was not forseen in these heady days.) The student figures for the canton of Glarus are clearly highly suggestive, indicating considerable interest in humanist learning among Swiss students in the first two decades of the sixteenth century. That interest was certainly shared by Huldrych Zwingli, the pastor of Glarus from 1506 to 1516, and formerly a student at both Vienna (1498–1502) and Basle (1502–6).

Zwingli's relation to both Erasmus and Luther is difficult to assess on the basis of explicit references in his published writings, in that he appears defensively to minimize his obligations to both for domestic political reasons.[79] Nevertheless, the considerable influence of both Erasmus in particular, and humanist editorial and textual undertakings in general, upon the development of his thought is well established. Zwingli embraced the humanist principle that historical and textual research – similar to that of Valla, which demonstrated the inauthenticity of the *Donation of Constantine* – should be freely employed in relation to ecclesiastical sources and traditions. Thus he argued that the tradition of priestly celibacy had been falsified at points,[80] and undertook critical historical inquiries that demonstrated that Swiss congregations had occasionally demanded – and been granted – the right of their clergy to marry.[81] Similarly, his researches into local liturgical practices indicated that the people of Glarus had been permitted to received communion in both kinds at various points in the past.[82] Here we find an essentially neutral humanist tool (historical inquiry) functioning as a weapon in a Reformer's armory. History was being put to polemical use.

The influence of humanism upon Zwingli is, however, by no means restricted to historical or textual inquiry. Zwingli's personal library contained a substantial number of works by both Erasmus and Luther. While the former were heavily annotated, apparently at an early stage,

the latter appear to have been used relatively rarely – or at least to have failed to attract the marginal annotations that are a sure sign of sustained engagement with the text.[83] Zwingli made his first trip to Basle to visit Erasmus in 1516, shortly after the publication of the latter's *Novum Instrumentum* on Froben's press, and his letter to the great humanist of April 29, 1516 – written shortly after that visit – clearly indicates how he had been won over to a reforming program embracing humanist cultural and educational ideals.[84] Furthermore, his letters dating from the remainder of that decade frequently make reference to his intention to go back to Basle. Although Zwingli learned Greek in 1513, with the express purpose of studying Scripture, it was through Erasmus's *Novum Instrumentum* of 1516 that this project was realized.[85] From his comments upon the inaccuracies of the Vulgate text, it is clear that Zwingli recognized the theological implications of the new sacred philology.[86] Indeed, Bullinger informs us that Zwingli was able to commit the entire Greek New Testament to memory while serving as the parish priest at Einsiedeln.[87] Although some have argued that a clear divergence is evident between the ways in which Erasmus and Zwingli regarded or appropriated biblical scholarship in the Einsiedeln years (1516–18),[88] the evidence for this suggestion is less than compelling. Zwingli clearly follows Erasmus's lead in several important areas, particularly in relation to biblical exegesis, the "spiritual" (in other words, internalized) understanding of religion, and the concept of *imitatio Christi*. Indeed, Zwingli frequently emphasized the importance of Erasmus's philological techniques to his expository work. The evidence certainly suggests that the Zwingli who began his ministry in Zurich on January 1, 1519 was an Erasmian, albeit with political convictions reflecting those of a narrower Swiss humanism, rather than the cosmopolitan humanist espoused by Erasmus.

An important consideration in establishing the origins of Zwingli's religious ideas is his soteriology: whereas for Luther, the question of how one might find a gracious God led to his intense personal preoccupation with the doctrine of justification, Zwingli's concerns appear to have been primarily with the reform and revitalization of the church – in other words, with the humanist vision of *Christianismus renascens*. Far from regarding the doctrine of justification as the center of the gospel, and the foundation of a coherent program of theological reform, Zwingli appears to have adopted a form of moralism, demonstrating clear and significant affinities with Erasmus's *philosophia Christi*.[89]

Zwingli's program of reform initially corresponds to that of the circle of Swiss humanists to which he belonged; his divergence from that program is probably to be dated from around the year 1520, after his arrival at Zurich and the inauguration of his reforming ministry.[90] This shift in attitude appears to rest on a growing awareness of the lack of impact of that ministry. Prior to that point, Zwingli appears to have been convinced that his humanist program of preaching was having its desired effect. In a letter to Myconius, dated December 31, 1519, Zwingli exults over the success of his program, which had already engendered more than two thousand "more or less enlightened" people.[91] Six months later, however, Zwingli appears to have conceded the inadequacy of his initial expectations. In a letter of July 24, 1520, Zwingli makes clear his disenchantment with the humanist educational program, as embodied in Erasmus's *philosophia Christi*. It seems that Zwingli recognized that the reforming battle in which he was engaged could only be won with divine assistance, rather than relying upon Quintillian's pedagogical insights.[92] At any rate, from this point onwards, Zwingli's theology exhibits a mixture of humanist and Reformed elements.[93] This potentially unstable amalgam of ideas involves humanist insights being retained alongside an increasing emphasis upon the priority of divine action in moral reflection and transformation, and the correct interpretation of Scripture through divine illumination.

The ambivalent influence of Erasmus upon Zwingli's later religious thought is best seen from the latter's *Commentarius de vera et falsa religione*, which left the presses of Froschauer in March 1525.[94] Writing to Vadian on May 28 of that same year, Zwingli reported that Erasmus suggested that the work was derivative, reflecting his own views.[95] Such convergence is immediately evident in the dedicatory epistle to the king of France, Francis I (an interesting choice, incidentally, suggesting Zwingli was aware of the changing religious situation in that nation), in which the theologians of the Sorbonne are ridiculed.[96] The work opens with a definition of *religio* that is obviously humanist in provenance, being taken directly from Cicero: "*omnia, quae ad cultum deorum pertinerent diligentes retractarent et tanquam relegerent, sunt dicti religiosi ex relegendo*."[97] Similarly, following Cicero, it is asserted that the existence of God can readily be ascertained by human reason: "*deum . . . esse, vulgo consensum est apud omnes gentes*."[98] Zwingli develops this idea to the point where he approaches the *logos spermatikos* of the second-century apologists, traces of which are evident in Erasmus's *Enchiridion*:

in that God is truth, signs (*semina*) of this divinity may be found in both nature and in humanity itself, and thus discerned by all. Nevertheless, it is clear that Zwingli's appeal to Scripture indicates that he regards these *imagines divini et vestigia* as inadequate as the basis of any reliable knowledge of God – thus developing a position that would be expanded and developed by Calvin in the opening chapters of the 1559 *Institutio* (see below).

Perhaps the most striking remaining affinities with Erasmus lie in Zwingli's "spiritualism" – in other words, with his emphasis upon the interior character of religion. Religion is primarily concerned with internal attitudes, rather than with external religious observances or ecclesiastical structures. The emphasis that both humanist and Reformer place upon the interior dimension of religion – evident in Zwingli's affirmation that "the Christian religion is nothing other than a firm hope in God through Jesus Christ and a blameless life fashioned after the example of Christ"[99] – suggests a lack of interest in matters of church structure and ceremonies. While this is certainly true of Erasmus, who often treated such matters as *adiaphora*, it is evident that Zwingli had quite definite views, particularly in relation to the sacraments, which he felt could not be compromised. Although there are clearly similarities between Erasmus and Zwingli at this point, they should not be exaggerated, nor should the critical importance of their divergences be overlooked.[100]

Alongside these clear convergences with Erasmianism, distinct divergences are evident within the *Commentarius*. The most significant of these is Zwingli's critique of Erasmus's concept of the *liberum arbitrium* (which, incidentally, dates from several months before Luther's more famous and savage attack on Erasmus's *de libero arbitrio*).[101] The deeply pessimistic view of human nature that Zwingli now adopts contrasts sharply with his own earlier views, as well as those of Erasmus. Linked with this pessimistic theological anthropology is an increasingly strong doctrine of providence, evident in the sermon *De providentia Dei*, by which an individual's destiny is understood to be determined by divine predestination, rather than by the human free will.[102] Curiously, however, Zwingli supports this theology with a sustained appeal to Seneca rather than to St Paul,[103] causing more than one commentator to suggest that Zwingli's thought is fundamentally Stoic rather than Christian at this point – and hence pointing to humanist influence at a perhaps unexpected point in his theology.

A second point in the *Commentarius* at which divergence from Erasmus is evident focuses on the scepticism Zwingli expresses concerning the means by which the humanists propose to reform the church. The vision of *Christianismus renascens* requires more than half measures if it is to be actualized, and Zwingli effectively argues that the measures proposed by the humanists are incapable of achieving their stated objectives.[104] The humanist vision of the reform of human nature and the church through a program of education is now regarded by Zwingli as quite unrealistic; what is really required is a divine reformation of both the individual believer and the church in which God, rather than human beings, is to be regarded as the chief agent of transformation. The growing radicalism of Zwingli in this respect appears to have led to his being regarded as a religious fanatic by at least some of his former humanist colleagues.

The second major Reformed theologian to be considered is Martin Bucer, the full extent of whose influence over the development of both Lutheran and Reformed theology is only now being appreciated. The origins of Bucer's theology are unquestionably to be traced to humanism.[105] His education at the Schlettstadt humanist school, his intensive study of the works of Erasmus,[106] and his correspondence with significant humanists (such as Beatus Rhenanus),[107] indicate his early humanist leanings. In 1518, Bucer was present at the Heidelberg disputation to hear Luther deliver his celebrated theses, and within days wrote to Beatus Rhenanus concerning his impressions of the Reformer and his significance.[108] This letter is of considerable importance, in that it indicates how seriously Bucer misunderstood Luther's theological concerns, viewing Luther's reforming agenda through Erasmian spectacles. For Bucer, Luther merely stated explicitly what Erasmus had already hinted at. It is clear that Bucer regards Luther as differing from Erasmus only in the forthrightness with which he stated his views. In this letter, Bucer tends to omit, or gloss over, Luther's views where they could not be accommodated to those of Erasmus; the remainder of Luther's theses were interpreted within an Erasmian framework.[109] In other words, he appears to have "productively misunderstood" the Reformer, in common with so many others at the time. Indeed, even when Bucer committed himself publicly to Luther, it seems that this commitment was primarily a personal affair, stemming from the personality of the Reformer and his program for reform, rather than the specific religious ideas underlying them. As has often been shown,

Bucer remained an Erasmian in his theology throughout the 1520s, despite the increasing alienation that developed between Bucer and Erasmus during this period.[110]

Erasmus's influence upon Bucer is at its most evident in his moralism. Thus Bucer, following Erasmus, places considerable emphasis upon the tropological sense of Scripture – in other words, upon the ethical application of the scriptural text to the specific historical situation of the reader.[111] Old and New Testament are *idem in substantia*, and both may be designated as *lex*. For Bucer, as for Erasmus, Scripture bears witness to the *lex Christi*, understood as an ethical pedagogical principle: "*Nam et sacra doctrina proprie moralis est, ars nimirum recte et ordine vivendi*."[112] The obvious difficulty in accommodating sentiments such as these with Luther's doctrine of justification (which seemed to the humanists to destroy the foundations of morality) led to Bucer radically modifying that doctrine, resulting in a strongly ethical conception of justification that prefigures that of later Pietism.[113] This point is of considerable importance, for a number of reasons. First, it indicates Bucer's failure to understand Luther's theology of justification, or sympathize with it. The origins of Bucer's theology are not to be sought in relation to the doctrine of justification, nor the agonizing over the status of fallen humanity *coram Deo* which is so evident in Luther's early theological reflections. Second, Bucer's concerns were, and appear to have remained, primarily ethical, his support for Luther apparently reflecting the "productive misunderstanding" of the great Reformer so widespread among humanists in the period 1517–21. The origins of Bucer's reforming theology are to be sought in the complex milieu of humanist ethical, spiritual, and political expectations, which are so pervasive a feature of the intellectual life of southern Germany, the Rhineland, and Switzerland in the first quarter of the sixteenth century, and which play so important a role in relation to the origins of the Reformed church.

The most significant theologian of the Reformed church is, of course, John Calvin. Calvin is, however, a second-generation reformer, whose importance lies not in relation to the *origins*, but the consolidation and later expansion of the reforming movement in the period 1536–64. Thus the 1536 *Institutio*, apparently modeled upon Luther's catechisms, is essentially pedagogical in content and style, concerned with educating and informing its reader. It is significant that the term *Institutio* would probably have been understood to mean something like "education,"

"instruction," or even "primer" by its sixteenth-century readers – Erasmus's *Institutio principis Christiani* of 1516 had established this sense as normative (Budé's *Institution du Prince* also follows the model). It will thus be clear that Calvin, despite his importance for the history and thought of the Reformation, assumes a minor place in any discussion of the intellectual *origins* of the Reformation. Indeed there are reasons for suggesting that Calvin's transition from humanist to Reformer parallels that of others (such as Zwingli), with perhaps the chief difference being the enigma that scholars have come to attach to the question of the date and nature of Calvin's "conversion."[114] As far as can be determined, the young Calvin was a humanist, with a good knowledge of (but – like Erasmus – little enthusiasm for) scholastic theology. Calvin's first published work was a commentary on Seneca's *De clementia*, and is generally regarded as being thoroughly humanist in character.[115] Although containing no significant indications of the manner in which his thought would develop, the text indicates that Calvin was already in possession of the literary and textual exegetical techniques that he would later apply so successfully to the text of Scripture. Just as the commentary on Seneca attempted to clear away all obstacles (such as contemporary allusions or modes of speech), preventing the reader from engaging directly with the thought of this rhetorician and politician, so Calvin would later attempt to permit the reader to engage directly with the world of the New Testament. At this point (1532) we find Calvin in the process of moving away from the study of law to that of *bonae litterae*[116] – but not necessarily toward becoming a Reformer.

It can also be argued that Calvin's understanding of theological language shows a strongly humanist tone. One of the most distinctive features of Calvin's theological method is his doctrine of "accommodation" – that is to say, the notion that divine revelation involved divine self-accommodation to the realities of human epistemic capacities. God, as Calvin often pointed out, adopted modalities of revelation adapted to humanity's weakened capacities.[117] This idea is not new; it can be instanced throughout secular writings on rhetoric of the classical period, works of Jewish philosophy, and the writings of the Greek fathers.[118] The idea, however, plays a particularly important role in the rhetorical and hermeneutical writings of Erasmus of Rotterdam.[119] For Erasmus, one of the most fundamental principles of rhetoric is that the lower is incapable of rising to the higher; if communication or persuasion

is to take place, the higher must lower itself. Erasmus finds this principle expressed in the New Testament mandate *omnia omnibus*, grounded in Paul's willingness to "become all things to all people" in order to commend and further the gospel.[120] For Erasmus, this general principle of accommodation is found at its highest in the Christian doctrine of the incarnation – that is to say, that God entered into human history in human form in the person of Jesus Christ. Calvin's basic doctrine embodies all the main features of Erasmus's approach, which he appeared to have regarded as an authentically Christian approach to rhetoric – that is to say, the theory of language – which he could expect to deploy theologically without controversy.

The most important recent contribution to the discussion concerning Calvin's shift from a generally humanist to a more specifically evangelical position has come from Alexandre Ganoczy, who argued that the documentary sources up to the year 1539 simply do not support the idea of a "sudden conversion" (*subita conversio*), referred to in the much later (1557) semiautobiographical preface to the Commentary on the Psalms.[121] Furthermore, the use of the term "conversion" is itself open to question, in that the penitential aspects of the concept, as it is normally understood today, are conspicuously absent from most contemporary understandings of the idea; these tend to focus on shifts in institutional loyalty and affililation, rather than the personal experiential aspects of the matter.[122] What can be said with at least some degree of confidence is that the 1530s witnessed the gradual unfolding of Calvin's "reforming vocation" (*vocation réformatrice*), in which Calvin steadily moved from a position initially characterized by Fabrisian humanism to one that was overtly evangelical. Unfortunately, there is no evidence of any direct link between Calvin and the reforming humanism of Lefèvre d'Etaples,[123] so this suggestion must remain conjectural. Nevertheless, Ganoczy, by drawing attention to the inadequacy of the contemporary sources, has highlighted not merely how little we know about Calvin's *subita conversio*, but how the documentary lacunae prevent us from ever being able to remedy the situation. We shall thus probably never know whether Calvin's *conversio* really was *subita* – or even a *conversio* in any meaningful sense of the word.

The most careful study of Calvin's relation to humanism to date suggests that Calvin's thought after his "conversion" demonstrates both continuity and discontinuity with the humanist tradition.[124] The continuity relates primarily to Calvin's continued use of classical culture as

a resource that he might exploit in the interests of both scholarship, preaching, and apologetics,[125] while the discontinuity relates to the radical dichotomy that Calvin recognizes between divine revelation and classical wisdom.[126] This dichotomy may be illustrated by Calvin's discussion of the theological significance of a natural knowledge of God.

The first five chapters of the 1559 *Institutio* represent a critical evaluation of a natural knowledge of God, in which Calvin enters into a dialog with Cicero's *De natura deorum*.[127] Cicero, in his exposition of the Epicurean natural theology, asserts that nature itself has imprinted the existence of the gods within human nature: "*Quae est enim gens aut quod genus hominum, quod non habeat sine doctrina anticipationem quandam deorum*?"[128] Calvin follows this line of reasoning exactly, arguing from the existence of *religionis semen* to that of God: "*Quendam inesse humanae menti, et quidem naturali instinct divinitatis sensum, extra controversiam ponimus*."[129] Although Cicero argues from such natural intuitions of divinity to the existence of the gods, and Calvin to the existence of *one* God, their starting position and ultimate conclusions are convergent. Furthermore, both Cicero and Calvin conclude that a natural knowledge of God includes not merely the fact of the *existence* of God, but also certain (admittedly limited) insights into the *nature* of God. For Cicero, such insights include the immortality and blessedness of the gods: "*Quae enim nobis natura informationem ipsorum deorum dedit, eadem insculpsit in mentibus ut eos aeternos et beatos haberemus*."[130] Calvin's analysis of the natural experience of God proceeds along similar lines, allowing him to deduce that God is both omnipotent and eternal.[131] Although Calvin might appear to derive such insights primarily on the basis of scriptural texts, a closer examination of his argument indicates that he formally establishes two essentially independent and distinct, although convergent, routes by which these insights may derived – Scripture and experience. Both Cicero and Calvin are further agreed, however, that humanity's natural knowledge of God is fragmentary and at times contradictory, and thus leads only to relatively certain statements concerning the nature of God. It is at this point that the radical differences between Cicero and Calvin – and the reasons why the latter chose to criticize the former – become evident.

For Cicero, the fact that humanity possesses inconclusive, fragmentary, and inconsistent knowledge of God is to be regarded as a liability, calling into question the basis of his theological statements. For Calvin,

this fact is a distinct advantage, as it points to the fundamental principle that humanity requires a more reliable source for such knowledge. In effect, Calvin exploits the inadequacy of natural revelation by pointing to the inherently more reliable statements concerning God made by Scripture itself. The *sensus divinitatis* known to humanity is shown to be consistent with what is found in Scripture – and the scriptural statements concerning the nature and identity of God are shown to correspond to, but to far surpass in reliability, consistency, and certainty, those that may be had from nature.[132] Calvin's purpose in engaging in dialog with Cicero at the opening of the 1559 *Institutio* is too easily overlooked, in that it indicates both the manner in which Calvin's humanism is made subservient to his evangelicalism, and also the significance that Calvin attaches to a direct engagement with the classical tradition, in that this permits him an *indirect* engagement with the humanist tradition itself. For Calvin, the wisdom of the ancient classical tradition concerning the knowledge of God, to which humanism made its appeal, may be seen at its best in Cicero – and that knowledge is shown to be fragmentary and lacking in certainty. It is, however, consistent with what may be known of God the creator from Scripture, which establishes substantially the same truths in a more certain manner, in addition to revealing an aspect of the knowledge of God of which nature knows nothing – the *cognitio Dei redemptoris*.[133] In this way, Calvin is able to demonstrate the inherent harmony of the classical tradition and Christianity, while at the same time indicating the superiority of the latter over the former, and laying the foundation for his *theologia verbi divini*. For Calvin, classical wisdom has its proper place within the parameters of a Christian theology, in that it demonstrates the necessity of, and partially verifies the substance of, divine revelation.

A second aspect of Calvin's theology in which an unequivocal divergence from the humanist tradition (especially Erasmianism) may be detected is his theology of justification. Following the Reformed tradition, Calvin accords the doctrine no place of special importance and it is clear that he, like other early Reformed theologians, was not concerned with the existential aspects of the doctrine that had so preoccupied Luther before him. In this respect, there is a certain degree of continuity between Calvin, the earlier Reformed tradition, and Erasmian humanism. Erasmus and Bucer developed an essentially moral theology of justification that is Christocentric in the sense that it embodies the principle of *imitatio Christi*; Calvin developed a doctrine of justification

that is Christocentric in the sense that fundamental change in the believer is understood to arise through the *insitio in Christum*.[134] Whereas both Erasmus and Bucer tend to make justification dependent upon *imitatio Christi*, Calvin understands both justification and sanctification to be the consequences of a foundational *insitio in Christum*. In this way, Calvin is able to avoid making justification contingent upon prior human ethical regeneration, while simultaneously maintaining a Christologically orientated theology of justification.

If Calvin's criticism of the classical tradition (here exemplified by Cicero) and Erasmian moralism represents one aspect of his relationship with humanism, his literary, philological, and textual tools represent another, considerably more positive, aspect of that relationship. Of particular importance is Calvin's exploitation of the classical rhetorical tradition as a vehicle – in both his sermons and the *Institutio* – for his theology.[135] Although it is not clear whether Calvin subordinates theology to rhetoric, as does Melanchthon (see below), it is certainly true that rhetoric influences the manner in which Calvin articulates his theological convictions.[136]

Humanism and the Origins of the Lutheran Church

The origins of the Lutheran Reformation are quite distinct from those of its Reformed counterpart. Whereas the Reformed theology originated in humanist circles, and developed in the cities of Switzerland and the Rhineland, Lutheranism originated, and initially developed, within the theological faculty of an obscure German university. Furthermore, whereas Reformed theology owed its origins to a group of thinkers, who interacted with each other to at least some extent, and underwent considerable development during its initial period, Lutheranism was shaped to a remarkable extent by the personal theological insights of a single individual – Martin Luther.

It is clear that Luther regarded the humanist movement as having placed at his disposal the textual and philological techniques necessary for his program of theological reform. Fundamental to Luther's reforming vocation was the conviction that the aspect of the Christian church requiring reform was not its morals, but its theology.[137] For Luther, the possibility of reforming the theology of the church through

the new techniques of "sacred philology," pioneered by Valla in the *Quattrocento*, was nothing less than providential, allowing him access to *die Sprachen* through which a program of reform might be developed.[138] Whatever disagreements Luther might have with Erasmus, he was initially unhesitant in recognizing the importance of the latter's textual and philological achievements in relation to the New Testament.[139] Luther's knowledge of the Hebrew language was the result of the humanist enterprise to increase familiarity with the languages and texts of the classical period, as were the editions of Augustine and other fathers that he employed in the course of his theological reflections. The texts – Scripture and the fathers in their original languages – on which Luther's reformation at Wittenberg would ultimately depend were only available through the activity of humanist editors and publishers, such as Erasmus and the brothers Amerbach. In this sense, Luther's debt to humanism was considerable. Events within the Wittenberg theological faculty in the first two decades of its existence, particularly the years 1516–19, will be considered to illustrate this point.

Although the personal influence of Christoph Scheurl upon the development of the university curriculum at Wittenberg in the opening years of the first decade of the sixteenth century should not be overlooked,[140] it seems that the driving force behind the introduction of what many regarded as a "humanist" curriculum came from the faculty of theology in the years 1517–19. It is, however, clear that the motivation underlying the reform of the theological curriculum owed little to the spirit of humanism, even though many humanists failed to appreciate this – once more, it is necessary to draw attention to the "productive misunderstanding" of the Reformers' theological program on the part of most humanists. The emergence of the *vera theologia* within the theological faculty at Wittenberg necessitated direct engagement with the original text of Scripture and of Augustine and thus led to the espousal of a program that appeared to coincide with that of the humanists.

The origins of this program may be traced to the autumn of 1516. On September 25, 1516, Luther presided over an academic disputation on the occasion of the promotion of Bartholomäus Feldkirchen to the degree of Bachelor of Divinity. Feldkirchen was Luther's protégé, and it is generally considered that the theses he chose to defend on this occasion had been drawn up by Luther himself.[141] In the course of this

disputation, Feldkirchen argued that the treatise *de vera et falsa poenitentia*, hitherto generally regarded as an authentically Augustinian text, should not be ascribed to Augustine at all, and supported this assertion by arguing that Augustine taught that humanity could not fulfill the commandments of God through its own reason and strength.[142] These assertions outraged Andreas Karlstadt (the dean of the Faculty of Theology at Wittenberg), who insisted that both Augustine and the scholastic theologians had been seriously misrepresented during the course of the debate.[143] Luther then proceeded to challenge Karlstadt to confirm his assertions, a challenge that Karlstadt had little option but to accept.[144] Unfortunately, Karlstadt did not have access to a reliable published edition of Augustine, and was thus obliged to travel to the Leipzig book fair on January 13, 1517 – some four months after the disputation – to purchase one. Significantly, Karlstadt, like most theologians of the early sixteenth century, was obliged to read his Augustine at second hand, in the form of collections of "sentences" extracted from his works, or references made to him in the writings of other theologians (such as those of Thomas Aquinas or Duns Scotus, with whose writings contemporary records indicate he was well acquainted).[145] As chapter 6 will indicate, the chief difficulty associated with this second-hand encounter with Augustine arises from the interpretation placed upon the Augustinian "sentence" by the secondary source: by isolating a sentence from its original context, for example, a serious misunderstanding of its meaning could result. Equally, any significant degree of selectivity on the part of the secondary source could lead to a distorted impression of Augustine's views, through the suppression of sentences in which different views are expressed or existing views modified or qualified. Karlstadt thus exemplifies the common problem encountered by medieval theologians in relation to their sources: Augustine tended to be known at second hand, through intermediaries of indeterminate reliability, with no real possibility of verifying the interpretation placed upon him by the secondary source.

Having purchased an edition of Augustine at Leipzig, Karlstadt proceeded to scour it for texts that he could cite against Luther. By April 1517, it is clear that Karlstadt had decided that Luther was basically right in his interpretation of Augustine. Swallowing his pride, he conceded his error and sought to prevent anyone repeating it. Toward this end, he published 151 theses defending an Augustinian theology over and against that of his former scholastic mentors, particularly Johannes

Capreolus.[146] In these theses, Karlstadt affirmed the supreme authority of Scripture, and a derivative authority of the fathers, particularly Augustine. In many ways, this may be seen as a humanist program, in that it was concerned with the integrity of texts and the establishment of reliable criteria for textual analysis. Indeed, there are excellent reasons for suggesting that at this early stage, Karlstadt saw himself developing a theological program similar to that already associated with Erasmus.[147] Yet the theological implications of this development went beyond textual issues. If Augustine did not say what Karlstadt had once believed him to say, there was a need to revise the received theology on the basis of this insight. Karlstadt's textual embarrassment was now converted into a program of theological reform at the University of Wittenberg.

On May 18, 1517, in the aftermath of the publication of Karlstadt's theses, Luther wrote in near ecstasy to his humanist colleague Johannes Lang concerning the changes that were taking place at Wittenberg: "*Theologia nostra et S. Augustinus prospere procedunt . . . Aristoteles descendit paulatim.*"[148] The *vera theologia* now gaining the ascendancy was that of the Bible and Augustine, and the rival theology, based upon Peter Lombard's *Sentences* and Aristotle, was in irreversible decline. Similarly, in the course of his lectures of 1517–18 on Augustine's work *de spiritu et litera*, Karlstadt pointed out to his students how they now had direct access to the text of the Bible and the fathers, and were no longer obliged to depend upon the scholastics for their theology.[149] In every respect, the theology faculty at Wittenberg appeared to be committed to a program of theological education that exactly paralleled that of the humanists – a point that was not lost on those humanists with whom Luther and Karlstadt corresponded (such as Christoph Scheurl, Johannes Lang, and Georg Spalatin).

This impression was confirmed through the revisions proposed to the theological curriculum at Wittenberg in March 1518.[150] According to Luther, the proposals included the regular teaching of the three sacred languages (Hebrew, Greek, and Latin), and lectures on Quintillian (whose educational theories so excited the humanists), and the abolition of lectures on aspects of medieval logic, including Aristotle. The position of lecturer in Hebrew attracted considerable attention from humanists – among those short-listed for the post was Johannes Oecolampadius, then still a humanist, and associated with the circle around Christoph Scheurl. It was the need for a lecturer in Greek that

attracted perhaps the most significant humanist to Wittenberg – Philip Melanchthon.[151]

By the time of the Leipzig Disputation of 1519, it was clear that the Wittenberg theological faculty as a whole was identified with a program of theological reform that generated considerable excitement within humanist circles, and apprehension in more traditional ecclesiastical circles.[152] Although Luther's posting of the Ninety-Five Theses on October 31, 1517,[153] and the Heidelberg Disputation of April 1518, singled him out as the most significant agitator within the faculty, it is clear that the faculty as a whole was prepared to identify itself with his actions.[154] Writing to Spalatin on October 14, 1518, Luther admitted how his actions had placed Karlstadt, the theological faculty, and the university itself at risk.

The role of Karlstadt in pioneering the program of reform is all too easily overlooked. Thus it was Karlstadt, not Luther, who was initially challenged to public debate by Eck, leading eventually to the Leipzig Disputation of 1519. It was Karlstadt, as well as Luther, who was subsequently excommunicated in the papal bull of October 1520. Nevertheless, the high standard of Luther's debating skills at Leipzig, together with the positions that he defended against Eck, served to concentrate the attention of the outside world onto the Saxon reformer, rather than his more senior (albeit considerably less charismatic) colleague – despite the fact that Karlstad had gained wide recognition as a humanist through his support for Reuchlin during the darker moments of that notorious controversy.[155] Moreover, it was in the aftermath of the Leipzig Disputation that humanism played its most significant role in furthering the ends of the Lutheran Reformation.

Before 1519, the reforming program at Wittenberg had attracted little attention, except from those humanists who had personal associations with Wittenberg or members of its theological faculty. The posting of the Ninety-Five Theses attracted considerable sympathy toward Luther from those (not necessarily humanists) hostile toward the indulgence traffic, and the Heidelberg Disputation served to identify (mistakenly, as it happened) Luther as an outspoken Erasmian through the correspondence of Martin Bucer with Beatus Rhenanus: "*cum Erasmo illi conveniunt omnia, quin uno hoc praestare videtu quod quae ille duntaxat insinuat, hic* [Luther] *aperte docet et libere*." The Leipzig Disputation of 1519, however, marks a turning point in the history of the Reformation, in that what had previously been a somewhat

arcane academic debate exploded into a *cause célèbre* throughout western Europe.

The agency that catalyzed this explosion was the humanist movement, which saw in Luther a representative of the "new learning" engaged in a serious and potentially pivotal conflict with the old order of authoritarian scholasticism. Humanist sodalities were responsible for turning an essentially private academic debate into a public (indeed, cosmopolitan) political and religious controversy. Through a "productive misunderstanding," Luther was hailed as the champion of the values of the "new learning," and came to serve as the focal point of a debate similar to that which had surrounded the person of Johannes Reuchlin a decade earlier. By this time, however the humanist movement was considerably stronger and more influential, and Luther soon found himself with supporters in humanist circles in Augsburg, Erfurt, Heidelberg, Leipzig, Nuremberg, Schlettstadt, and Strasbourg.[156] Nevertheless, that support appeared to rest upon the mistaken supposition that Luther and Erasmus were engaged upon a common program, with shared goals and assumptions – a supposition that clearly underlies Albrecht Dürer's suggestion (1521) that Erasmus should assume the leadership of the Wittenberg Reformation in place of Luther, who had by then been incarcerated.[157]

Nevertheless, despite the clear affinities between the theological program adopted by the Wittenberg faculty in 1518 and humanist ideals, these affinities served to mask the crucial differences between the *vera theologia* and the *philosophia Christi*. The Wittenberg faculty were concerned with the articulation of a reforming theology that differed from that of scholasticism in terms of its content, rather than its form. Scripture and the fathers, particularly Augustine, were studied in order to establish the content of this *vera theologia*. The emphasis upon Augustine was the consequence of the *theological* judgment (unacceptable to most humanists, who tended to apply the criterion of *eloquentia*) that he represented the most reliable of the fathers, and led to an anthropological pessimism (particularly evident in the writings of Luther) that sharply contrasted with the optimism of Erasmus. The controversy between Luther and Erasmus of 1524–5 over the freedom of the will is already prefigured in their differing attitudes toward theological sources in the period 1515–19.

Furthermore, the hermeneutical principles applied to Scripture by both Luther and Karlstadt differed considerably from those of Erasmus,

as will become clear in a later chapter. Although both the humanists and the Wittenberg Reformers appeared to many to be committed to a similar program in the period 1515–19, radical differences lay beneath superficial similarities. Luther and his supporters appear to have exploited both the humanist movement and individual humanists in their struggle for the reformation of the doctrine of the church, both through the acquisition of the necessary textual and philological tools, and by gaining political support at a critical juncture in the development of the movement. Without humanism, there would have been no Reformation – because the Reformers needed the scholarly and political support of humanism until the movement had developed sufficiently to take care of itself.[158]

Confusion has arisen as to the influence of humanism upon the origins of Luther's distinctive reforming theology through misleading definitions of the term "humanism." This chapter has sought to emphasize that humanism is not to be identified with the views and preoccupations of Erasmus of Rotterdam, nor with a specific network of philosophical, anthropological, or theological doctrines – such as a specific doctrine of grace. Kristeller's broad definition of humanism in terms of its programmatic appeal *ad fontes*, alluded to earlier, unquestionably permits Luther to be regarded as a biblical humanist, similar in this respect to his Erfurt teacher Nikolaus Marschalk. Nevertheless, Luther's use of humanist textual tools in his early biblical exegesis (1513–16) must not be allowed to obscure the fact that the hermeneutical principles that Luther brings to bear upon his text appear to owe more to scholasticism than to humanism – as we shall see later – nor the uncomfortable fact that Luther appears to employ such methods to engage in a constructive, if ultimately highly critical, dialog with the theology of the *via moderna*. Even after his theological breakthrough (assuming this may be dated in 1515), Luther continued to employ both the theological framework and vocabulary of the *via moderna*. Luther was an outsider to humanist circles at this stage; he may have drawn on resources that they made available, but he was not seen as a member of their international *respublica litteraria*, or its more local embodiments, such as the *sodalitas litteraria Rhenana*.[159]

Luther's correspondence with humanists before 1517 was limited to a few individuals (such as Scheurl), and the initiative in this correspondence generally appears to have been taken by the humanists, rather than by Luther himself, suggesting that Luther did not regard

humanism as an important aspect of his theological method. Although Luther appears to have appreciated the importance of rhetorical theory in relation to the theology of the "Word of God," the correspondence between the humanist analysis of the transrational power of human speech and Luther's concept of the "Word of God" is at best remote.

Perhaps most significant of all the considerations to be taken into account in evaluating the influence of humanism upon the origins of Luther's theology, however, is the role of humanism in relation to his theological preoccupation with the question of justification, particularly the question of what *iustitia* is required of humanity *coram Deo*. As the following chapter will indicate, the evidence for any *decisive* influence of humanism in this crucial matter is conspicuously absent, in that Luther's theological breakthrough appears to rest on the application of an essentially scholastic hermeneutical scheme to the texts under consideration. Although the relationship between the origins of Luther's personal theological insights and the origins of the Reformation is far too complex to permit their identification, it is clear that humanism was merely one of several elements that contributed to shaping the origins of the Lutheran Reformation in the period 1513–19. Luther's reformation was unquestionably catalyzed by humanist tools and methods – but the *origins* of the distinctive ideas underlying it appear ultimately to lie elsewhere.

Although it is possible that humanism exercised a less than decisive impact upon the origins of Lutheran theology, it is clear that its influence over the propagation of that theology was considerable. Humanist and Reformer alike appreciated the importance of rhetoric and pedagogy (particularly the educational theories of Quintillian)[160] in the propagation of the ideas of the Lutheran Reformation. This can be seen particularly clearly in the way in which the specific doctrines of the Lutheran reformation were systematized and disseminated. The first work of systematic theology to emerge from the Lutheran Reformation was Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* of 1521. This work clearly betrays the influence of the classical rhetorical tradition, much appreciated by the humanists, particularly in terms of the organization of its material.[161] Melanchthon adopts the principle that theology may be organized around a single central doctrine, which effectively provides the key to Scripture. That key, according to Melanchthon, is not the Erasmian *imitatio Christi*, but Luther's doctrine of justification *sola fide*. The rhetorical origins of Melanchthon's *Loci* are evident in his 1519

treatise on rhetoric,[162] in which he makes reference to the principle of the *locus didacticus*. Although the topical method of expounding theology appears to have been particularly effective in the first phase of the Reformation,[163] it increasingly became recognized as a hindrance to systematic theological exposition. Indeed, it is possible to argue that the weakness of Lutheran theology in the period 1540–75, particularly when viewed in relation to contemporary Reformed theology, lay precisely in the method of organization bequeathed to Lutheranism by Melanchthon. As the range of *topoi* or *loci* increased, not least through the rise of controversy between the evangelical factions, Melanchthon's initially elegant system became increasingly cumbersome, incapable of coping with the considerable pedagogical pressure that came to be placed upon it.

On the basis of the considerations noted in this chapter, it will be clear that the relationship between humanism and the origins of the Reformation is complex, reflecting the heterogeneity of both the early Reforming movement and of humanism itself. It is a truism that humanism was a contributing factor to the Reformation. In that the Reformers were dependent upon reliable texts of the Bible and the fathers, the philological and literary techniques to analyze them, and political support when the occasion demanded it, they were clearly reliant upon the humanist movement. That does not, however, permit us to conclude that humanism was the *cause* of the Reformation, although it was unquestionably an essential catalyst. Although there is some value in provisionally designating the Reformers as "biblical humanists," the tension between humanist and Reformer concerning both the perceived status of Scripture and the spirit in which it should be approached should be noted. While generalizations are notoriously unreliable, particularly in so complex a field, it seems that the essential *continuity* between humanist and Reformer in relation to Scripture concerns the fields of textual and philological inquiry, with a potential *discontinuity* in relation to the hermeneutical principles employed in its interpretation. So important are these matters that they must be pursued in later chapters, to which this discussion must be regarded as an introduction. Our attention must first turn to the other late medieval intellectual movement that had considerable influence over the Reformation – scholastic theology.

3

Late Medieval Theology and the Reformation

The importance of scholastic theology to the intellectual origins of the Reformation is undisputed. It has been known for some time that Luther's theological formation can only be understood as a process of development within the contours of scholastic theology, initially leading to the formulation of a different style of scholastic theology, before finally the old wineskins proved incapable of holding Luther's powerful new wine. As will become clear in this chapter, recent research has drawn attention to Zwingli's early interest in Scotism, raising new possibilities of patterns of intellectual dependencies that earlier generations had overlooked. Yet the suggestion that the ideas of leading Reformers may owe their intellectual origins to scholasticism, to however limited an extent, is regarded with suspicion in many quarters, not least within Protestant theological circles.[1]

The multifaceted character of late medieval theology is well illustrated in the unedifying exchange of views between Philip Melanchthon and the theologians of the Sorbonne in 1521, in the course of which at least eight theological schools were identified: *Albertistae* (following Albertus Magnus), *Egidistae* (following Giles of Rome), *Thomistae* (following Thomas Aquinas), *Scotistae* (following Duns Scotus), *Scotellistae* (following Peter of Aquila), *Modernistae* and *Occamistae* (following William of Ockham), and *Gregoriistae* (following Gregory of Rimini).[2] The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries witnessed the origins and subsequent consolidation of a radical new intellectual movement, initially associated with William of Ockham, which was destined to exercise considerable influence over the faculties of arts in many late medieval universities. In that many of the Reformers (particularly those within the Wittenberg theological faculty in the period 1506–19) were deeply influenced by late medieval theological currents, an analysis of the intellectual origins

of the Reformation must include an evaluation of the possible influence of such currents upon the evolution of the new reforming theologies. This movement is still frequently referred to as "nominalism," despite the potentially misleading nature of the term.[3] In view of the considerable influence that this movement is now known to have exercised over the intellectual origins of the Reformation, it is necessary to examine it in some detail, and distinguish the various elements of this complex late medieval intellectual movement. The problem of defining the movement will serve as a starting point.

Nominalism: The Problem of Definition

The previous chapter considered the difficulties associated with the definition of the term "humanism," and noted how P. O. Kristeller's understanding of the term as a broad cultural and educational movement permitted what had appeared to be an increasingly unusable concept (given the intense scholarly activity in the field, which exposed its multifaceted nature) to be retained by historians.[4] In the past half-century, extensive research into the logical, epistemological, and theological views of writers traditionally designated as "nominalists" has revealed a similar picture: there appears to be little in common between the figures in question, other than a rejection of realism. Increasingly, the scholarly discussion of the matter has come to accept that viable definitions of types of scholasticism focus on issues of philosophical and theological *method* rather than philosophical or theological *content*.[5] Whereas the term "humanism" has been retained in the scholarly literature, however, there is an increasing recognition that the term "nominalism" must be abandoned, in that it appears to be an ultimately incoherent – and hence unusable – historical concept. The question of what replaces it is thus of no small importance.

The origins of late medieval "nominalism" were once held to lie in the logical terminism of twelfth-century figures such as Roscelin or Peter Abelard, according to which universals were concepts created by the mind without extramental referents, and hence did not possess any significance as descriptions of external reality. It was held that fourteenth-century figures such as William of Ockham and Gregory of Rimini developed this implicit atomism to the point where the ontological synthesis of High Scholasticism, associated with Albertus Magnus

and Thomas Aquinas, was destroyed.[6] This view has been subjected to considerable criticism in recent years, with particular attention being paid to the relation between the "nominalism" of Abelard and Ockham.

In a seminal essay of 1930,[7] Paul Vignaux argued that the correct meaning of the term could only be ascertained by identifying the *differentiae* between the two thinkers: this approach is now being increasingly recognized as fruitful. Jean Jolivet and Martin Tweedale were able to demonstrate the radically different intellectual environments in which Abelard and Ockham developed their theories of the relation of thought, language, and entities, and to indicate that Ockham's "nominalism" was quite distinct from that of Abelard.[8] lt is certainly true that Ockham is a "nominalist" if either or both of the following features are regarded as determinative: (1) if an *epistemological* criterion is applied, by which a universal concept is established on the basis of individual entities, and (at least to some extent) describes them; (2) if an *ontological* criterion is applied, by which universal concepts are understood to signify extramental referents, without implying that they are in themselves extramental. But this does not mean that Ockham regards universals as figments of an overactive human imagination.[9] It is this aspect of Ockham's thought that has forced upon his interpreters the necessity of finding an alternative designation for his epistemology and logic. Perhaps the most satisfactory alternative to "nominalism" to date is "realistic conceptualism."[10]

Ockham appears to have been the first thinker to explore systematically the discrepancy between the conceptual and the ontological, while at the same time recognizing their interdependence. He neither eliminates universals, nor does he accept the *independent* reality of universals. Thus propositions containing universal terms (such as "white") may be regarded as legitimate inferences based upon the experience of individual extramental entities. The perception that the universal quality "white" is similar in two distinct individual extramental entities is not to be regarded as a purely intramental construction. Ockham thus appears to succeed in safeguarding concepts from being relegated to the status of purely internal mental constructs.[11] Indeed, it may be suggested that he was the first to combine an epistemology based upon the primacy of individual cognition with an individual ontology that had no place for anything within or beyond the individual that was not itself individual – and in this way is able to avoid the difficulty of seeming to subordinate ontology (being) to epistemology (concepts).[12]

This (admittedly difficult) point is of considerable importance in relation to the general view of nominalism adopted by an earlier generation of scholars, in that it calls into question whether Ockham is a "nominalist" in any meaningful or coherent sense of the term.[13] It is therefore significant that the term "nominalist" appears to have ceased to be used during the thirteenth century, and was only reintroduced in the fifteenth century to refer to a specific way of teaching logic.[14] The use of the term "nominalist" in connection with the teaching of William of Ockham is thus an anachronism.

Detailed investigation of the reception of Ockham's thought in the period 1320–50 has also raised serious doubts concerning the coherence of "nominalism." Thus most late thirteenth-century and early fourteenth-century thinkers regarded the *species in medio* as essential, in that cognition was understood to involve an abstraction from sense experience. Ockham's radical contribution to this debate was to deny the necessity of such a species.[15] Ockham's view, far from being readily received by the Oxford circle associated with him, was subjected to sustained criticism by figures such as John of Reading, Walter Chatton, Robert Holcot, William Crathorn, and Adam Wodeham.[16] On the basis of this striking observation, it may reasonably be concluded that, "in epistemology at any rate, there seems at Oxford to have been no school of *Ockhamistae*."[17]

A similar divergence is evident within the so-called "nominalist school" in relation to the question of the nature of the object of knowledge. For Ockham, the object of knowledge was the *proposition* – or more accurately, the conclusion of a demonstration. In rejecting this view, Walter Chatton argued that the object of knowledge was actually the thing to which the proposition itself referred. By 1330, Willian Crathorn had revised this view: the object of knowledge was the entire significate of the proposition (usually known as the *complexe significabile*).[18] This idea was developed, with important argumentation, by Adam Wodeham, under the phrase *significatum totale conclusionis*.[19] The same phrase and argumentation was later adopted by Gregory of Rimini at Paris,[20] thus establishing a link between the Parisian and Oxford schools. But, as will be evident, the view that finally became adopted was not that of Ockham: the central idea of the *complexe significabile* is due to either Crathorn or Wodeham (depending on the precise dating of Wodeham's comments, which may date from earlier than 1333),[21] and was articulated in conscious opposition to Ockham.

The view that "nominalism" was a radical *anti*-Ockhamist movement, perhaps centered upon William of Crathorn,[22] indicates how much the traditional view of "nominalism" requires revision.[23]

The serious limitations that are to be placed upon both continuing uses of the term "nominalism" may be illustrated from the astonishingly diverse theological views associated with writers who are unquestionably "nominalist" in their logic and epistemology, such as Robert Holcot, Pierre d'Ailly, Gregory of Rimini, and Hugolino of Orvieto.[24] While Gregory of Rimini has clearly been influenced by Ockham in relation to his epistemology and natural theology,[25] his soteriology diverges radically from the earlier writer. It will be obvious that the four theologians just mentioned adopt radically different theologies of justification, the first two adopting a theology that approaches (although cannot actually be said to constitute) some form of Pelagianism, while the latter are among the most ferociously anti-Pelagian theologians known in the later medieval period.[26] This point has been something of a *crux interpretativum* for those who wish to maintain the viability of the term "nominalism" to designate a particular school of thought in the later medieval period. In that Gregory of Rimini unequivocally rejects both the Thomist *distinctio realis* and the Scotist *distinctio formalis* in favor of the *complexe significabile*, the traditional identification of Gregory as the "standard bearer of the nominalists" (*antesignanus nominalistarum*) is unquestionably correct. Given Gregory's strongly Augustinian views on theological anthropology and the doctrines of predestination, merit, and justification, however, which are diametrically opposed to the more genial insights of Robert Holcot and Pierre d'Ailly, it became necessary for intellectual historians who wished to retain a meaningful concept of "nominalism" to find some way of coping with the incoherence of the notion that this exposed. The simplest way of dealing with this anomaly was to treat Gregory as an example of "nominalistic diversity,"[27] and hope that the problem would go away.

This proved to be a forlorn hope. Studies of the reception of Gregory's ideas made it clear that a wider range of writers drew appreciatively on his ideas, including Henry of Langenstein, Hugolino of Orvieto, Marsilius of Inghen, Peter of Candia, and Pierre d'Ailly. Although this influence was widespread, it appears to have been especially concentrated within his own Augustinain Order. As the views of a circle of thinkers based on the writings of Gregory (such as Hugolino of Orvieto) came to be better understood, it became clear that there appeared to be a distinct,

coherent school of thought particularly associated with the Augustinian Order, which generally adopted a strongly "nominalist" theory of signification, yet whose theology of grace was diametrically opposed to that of Holcot, d'Ailly, or Biel. Furthermore, it became clear that even the older Luther regarded himself as a "nominalist." In a remarkable fragment of his *Table-Talk*, Luther discussed the difference between "terminism" and "realism," correctly identifying the latter as including Albertists, Thomists, and Scotists (in other words the *via antiqua*), and the former Ockhamists. According to Luther, the Ockhamists argued that the term *humanitas* named all humans individually and did not refer to a common humanity, existing in all humanity, as Thomas and the older realists maintained. Although Luther appears slightly confused over Ockham's distinction between *terminus conceptus* and *terminus prolatus* – and we must remember that Luther and his minor Boswells had food and drink as well as epistemology to think about – it is clear that he appreciated the essential difference between "realism" and "nominalism" (or "terminism"), and wished himself to be regarded as *terminista modernus*.[28] Given Luther's views on the theology of grace at this juncture, it would be an imprudent scholar who suggested that a "nominalist" epistemology implied a soteriology similar to that of Biel. It is clear that a "nominalist" philosophy is devoid of specific soteriological connotations.

There has, therefore, been a growing realization of the independence of many fourteenth-century figures who were traditionally grouped together and designated "nominalists." Similarly, it is now appreciated that there are serious, possibly even insuperable, difficulties attending the attempt to speak of "schools" or "traditions" in the fourteenth century. Even the modest term "Ockhamist," once thought to be an entirely appropriate designation for thinkers such as Holcot, Wodeham, and Crathorn, is now realized to be potentially seriously misleading, for reasons such as those we have noted above. This is not to say that generalizations cannot be made, for they clearly can; it is simply to draw attention to the complexity and diversity of what was once thought to be a relatively homogeneous movement, and hence to the strength of the case for ceasing to use the term "nominalism."

The present chapter is particularly concemed with two late medieval theological movements, both of which have been designated as "nominalism" in the past, despite their radical divergence. These are the school of thought associated with Pierre d'Ailly and Gabriel Biel, now usually

known as the *via moderna*, and that associated with Gregory of Rimini and Hugolino of Orvieto, now usually known as the *schola Augustiniana moderna*. In the following sections, the nature of these movements will be considered, before their influence upon the intellectual origins of the Reformation is examined in more detail.

Via Moderna

In recent years, the late medieval movement traditionally known as "nominalism" has been subjected to intense scrutiny, resulting in the recognition of its inherent heterogeneity and incoherence. It is certainly true that the later medieval period witnessed a polarization within many university faculties of arts arising from the rival views of "realists" and "nominalists": the testimony of Philip Melanchthon to the tensions at Tübingen in the 1510s[29] parallels similar tensions evident in fourteenth-century Paris[30] and fifteenth-century Heidelberg,[31] to note but two of the better documented instances of the phenomenon. Nevertheless, it would be a serious error of historical judgment to suppose that the debate over realism defined the universal horizon of intellectual history throughout the period 1320–1520. There are excellent reasons for suggesting that a number of significant factors conspired to generate a general trend toward a "nonrealist" epistemology in the later medieval period, and that theologians who might otherwise have little in common nevertheless shared such epistemological presuppositions, precisely because they came to be so widely held. We have already noted the radically divergent soteriologies associated with theologians who shared a nonrealist epistemology (such as Pierre d'Ailly and Gregory of Rimini).[32] Similarly, epistemological divergences between thinkers were not *a priori* grounds for concomitant theological divergence: Oberman has helpfully pointed out how Conrad Summenhart (representing the *via antiqua*) and Gabriel Biel (representing the *via moderna*) converge in the field of theological ethics, despite their clear epistemological differences.[33] Although clearly an important aspect of late medieval thought, particularly in northern European universities, the realist–nominalist debate should not be misunderstood to define *a priori* a parallel dichotomy within the sphere of *religious* thought.

A further point that must be borne in mind when assessing the character and influence of the *via moderna* in the late medieval period

relates to local heterogeneity within the movement. However much the historian may desire to simplify complex situations and depict "nominalism" as an essentially well-defined and relatively homogeneous movement throughout western Europe – thus permitting the generalizations upon which so much Reformation historiography is ultimately grounded – the evidence suggests that the *via moderna* actually developed local characteristics associated with the intellectual centers at which it was based. Although William of Ockham may be credited with the initiation of the movement, its specific local forms at the Universities of Oxford, Paris, Heidelberg, and Tübingen were shaped by personalities with differing concerns and emphases. At Paris, the movement was specifically associated with Jean Buridan and Nicolas Oresme; at Heidelberg, with Marsilius of lnghen; at Tübingen with Gabriel Biel and Wendelin Steinbach.[34]

Although the movement was often designated as the *via nominalium*[35] or *via modernorum*,[36] it was more frequently known after a prominent personality associated with the movement – such as the *via Marsiliana* at Heidelberg (after Marsilius of Inghen)[37] or the *via Gregorii* at Wittenberg (apparently after Gregory of Rimini)[38] – hence raising the question of whether the *via* referred to is the *via moderna* as *exemplified by* or as *modified by* these individuals. Marsilius and Gregory, it need hardly be added, had somewhat different interests and methodologies. Despite the local variations evident within the *via moderna*, a number of elements common to the various late medieval thinkers associated with the movement may be identified. Two elements of particular interest are the logico-critical tool of the dialectic between the two powers of God, and the voluntarism so characteristic of the movement. These elements will be considered individually.

The dialectic between the two powers of God is one of the most important, and most frequently misunderstood, theological tools of the late medieval period. Through the appeal to this dialectic, the theologians of both the *via moderna* and the *schola Augustiniana moderna* were able to eliminate unnecessary theological concepts and hypotheses. In effect, this dialectic underlies "Ockham's Razor": *quia frustra fit per plura quod potest equaliter per pauciora*.[39] This radical elimination of unnecessary theologoumena is of considerable importance to the present study, in that it indicates a revision of the ontologically inflationary theologies of High Scholasticism in favor of a more conceptually economical deontological theology. The nature and score of this dialectic

should be established first, before further analysis. We have already explored some aspects of this matter in chapter 1 (see pp. 20–3); some further comments are now appropriate.

Although the origins of the dialectic between the two powers of God is to be sought in the late eleventh or early twelfth centuries, it came to be of major importance in the Parisian Averroist controversy of the thirteenth century.[40] The basic difficulty facing theologians such as Henry of Ghent and Duns Scotus related to the question of how God could be said to act *reliably* without simultaneously implying that God acted out of *necessity*. For the Averroists, the claim that God acted reliably was essentially an admission that God's actions were dictated by predictable known external constraints that prevented God from acting arbitrarily, hence leading to the conclusion that, if God acted reliably, God acted of necessity. The initial difficulty faced by the defenders of the divine freedom was that a conceptual framework was not available by which God's reliability might be upheld, without simultaneously conceding that God acted through the force of external constraints. The dialectic between the two powers of God provided a means of avoiding this dilemma.[41]

The essential distinction underlying this dialectic concerns the realms of the *hypothetical* and the *actual*. In that God is omnipotent, God is able to do anything, provided that logical contradiction is not involved. The fact that God is unable to construct a circular triangle is thus not seen as compromising God's omnipotence. Out of an initial set of possibilities, God was at liberty to actualize any (provided that logical contradiction did not ensue). However, God did not actualize each and every possibility: only a subset of the initial set of possibilities was selected for actualization. A careful distinction must therefore be drawn between the subset of actualized possibilities, and the subset of unactualized possibilities which, although hypothetically possible, will never now be actualized. In other words, God must be thought of as possessing the *ability* to do many things that God does not *will* to do in the past, present, or future. God's freedom in relation to the initial set of actualizable possibilities is designated as the sphere of the "absolute power (*potentia absoluta*) of God," whereas the subset of actualized possibilities pertains to the "ordained power (*potentia ordinata*) of God."

The dialectic between these two powers permits both the divine reliability and freedom to be upheld. God is free, in that the divine selection of initial possibilities *de potentia absoluta* was uncoerced: in

other words, God was not subject to an external constraints in the selection of the subset of possibilities to be actualized. Once that subset was selected and actualized, however, God was under a *self-imposed* – not externally imposed – obligation to respect the order of actualized possibilities that God established. Although God's freedom is restricted in this matter, it is a self-imposed constraint, arising from the establishment of the ordained order: *de potentia Dei ordinata*, no violation of that order is possible. It will therefore be evident that the *potentia Dei absoluta* and *potentia Dei ordinata* are not two different courses of action open to God at any given moment in historical time, the latter being the normal or natural mode of action and the former the miraculous or supernatural, but rather represent two quite distinct orders of existence. God is totally reliable, in that having established the ordained order as an act of divine creative will, God remains faithful to that order. To act contrary to it would imply a contradiction or incoherence within the divine will, which is unthinkable.[42]

Although the dialectic between the two powers of God was employed in the thirteenth century to defend the divine freedom, the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries saw the device become a speculative technique for the elimination of redundant ontological concepts, or the clarification of necessary concepts. The former application of the technique can be illustrated by considering the critique of the role of supernatural habits in justification, and the latter by the analysis of the nature of the incarnation.

Before the theological renaissance of the late eleventh and twelfth centuries, justification tended to be conceived as a personal encounter between God and humanity, proceeding without the necessity of created intermediates.[43] In the twelfth century, however, one of the most significant theologoumena of High Scholasticism began to emerge – the idea that, as justification involves an *ontological* change in humanity, an ontological intermediate is required in the process of justification. This intermediate was to be identified with the created habit of grace or charity. For Peter Aureole, there was an ontologically necessary relation between a created habit and justification, so that, *ex natura rei*, such a habit was implicated in the process of the justification of humanity.[44] In other words, given the nature of divine justification, such a habit is required as a matter of natural necessity, given the nature of the entities involved in this process. For Ockham, however, the reasoning underlying this assertion was fallacious at a crucial point,

which he exposed through applying the dialectic of the two powers of God.[45]

For Ockham, the implication of created habits in justification is not a consequence of the nature of the process of justification or the ontological identity of the entities involved, but results from a divine decision that they shall be thus implicated. To suggest that habits are involved in justification as a matter of necessity (*ex natura rei*) is to imply that God was subjected to external constraint in establishing the created order, which is unthinkable. *De potentia absoluta*, God could have established an order of being in which created habits are *not* involved in justification, in that there is no logical contradiction involved in this suggestion. Ockham exploits the tension between the absolute and ordained powers to demonstrate the contingency of the role assigned to created habits in justification. The fact that they are involved in the established order is thus the result of God's decision that this shall be the case. In effect, Ockham works with a concept of *covenantal*, rather than *ontological*, causality: created habits are involved in the causal sequence of justification, not because of the nature of the entities involved (*ex natura rei*), but on account of the divine will (*ex pacto divino*).[46]

While Ockham does not deny that created habits are involved in justification *de facto*, he demonstrates that there is no necessary reason why they should be. The ontological basis that the High Scholasticism of the thirteenth century established for the necessary involvement of created habits in justification was thus shown to be inadequate. Although is not clear precisely what role the later theologians of the *via moderna* assigned to created habits, it is evident that there was a growing trend in the later medieval period, particularly within the *schola Augustiniana moderna*, to conceive primarily justification in *personal* or *relational* terms, and thus avoid the ontological conceptualization of the matter so characteristic of the earlier medieval period. As will be indicated later in this chapter, the general trend among the Reformers to deny an ontological dimension to justification represents a continuation of this critique of the conceptual foundations of the *habitus* theology. It is of interest to note that the Council of Trent appears to have conceded many of the key points of the modern critique of such habits in justification, in that the Tridentine decree on justification avoids specific mention or discussion of the notion.

The deontologizing of the justification of humanity is only one consequence of the systematic application of the logico-critical tool of

the dialectic of the two powers of God. The deontologizing of the relation of humanity to God, achieved in this manner, is a general feature of the theology of both the *via moderna* and *schola Augustiniana moderna*. The Scotist emphasis upon the *acceptatio divina* – understood as a direct personal acceptance of the believer by God, irrespective of the secondary means by which this end was achieved[47] – was developed and consolidated by these theologians of the later medieval period, with the result that justification tended to be seen as a personal act of divine will, foreshadowing the personalism of the Reformers in this respect. If the humanist movement rejected the ontological theology of High Scholasticism on account of its conceptual complexity, the theologians of the *via moderna* were able to eliminate it through demonstrating its ontological redundancy.

The theologians of the *via moderna* developed the concept of the reliability of the *potentia ordinata* with reference to the notion of a "covenant" or "contract" (*pactum*) between God and humanity.[48] It is this *pactum*, established unilaterally by God, that constitutes the turning point of the doctrines of justification associated with the *via moderna*. God is understood to have determined to reward people who do *quod in se est* (which may here be translated loosely as "doing their best") with the gift of justifying grace. Those who meet the minimal precondition for justification (in other words, those who do *quod in se est*) will be justified on account of God's faithfulness to the *pactum*. This cannot be regarded as amounting to God being under an external obligation to someone else, or to some abstract and autonomous principles independent of God. Rather, the *pactum* articulates the critical notion of *divine self-limitation*, which is particularly focused on the notion of faithfulness to a publicly stated promise – a notion that is of no small importance to Luther's theology in the late 1510s and early 1520s.[49]

As Robert Holcot thus pointed out, God may therefore be said to justify someone who does *quod in se est* out of necessity, *provided* that this is understood as a "necessity of consequence" (*necessitas consequentiae*) rather than an "absolute necessity" (*necessitas absoluta*).[50] Similarly, Gabriel Biel emphasized that God acted in this manner as a deliberate act of will, by which God entered into a personal obligation to humanity through the covenant and promised to reward anyone who does *quod in se est* with justifying grace. Although God is under no obligation to anyone *ex natura rei*, such an obligation exists *ex pacto suo* on account of

God's faithfulness to God's own decisions, which in turn reflect the divine nature itself.[51] Although there is no necessary *ontological* connection between some doing *quod in se est* and justification, God has ordained that such causal relationship shall exist *ex pacto suo*.

It is considerations such as these that suggest that the late medieval period witnessed a general transition from *ontological* to *covenantal* understandings of causality. The relationship between God and humanity was now conceived covenantally, permitting an extensive degree of correlation with the covenantal language and themes of both the Old and New Testaments,[52] rather than ontologically. This final dismantling of the ontological framework of the God–human relationship may be regarded as the necessary theological prelude to Luther's "biblical realism," in that it permitted this relationship to be conceived *personally*, allowing the same realistic imagery of the Old and New Testaments to be employed in responsible theological discussion. Thus, for example, the concept of "grace" was no longer considered primarily as a created intermediate species interposed between humanity and God, but rather as an aspect of God's disposition toward humanity.[53]

A number of points of importance emerge from this covenantal understanding of the God–human relationship.[54] First, the precondition for justification is essentially the same under both the old and the new dispensations. There is no radical dichotomy between the Old and New Testaments in this respect: under each, the precondition for justification is that someone must do *quod in se est*, which Biel defines as *declinare . . . a malo et facere bonum*.[55] The consequent "Old Testament character" of the ethics of the *via moderna* has often been noted.[56] Second, there is a highly significant Christological lacuna in the soteriology of the *via moderna*, in that the salvation of humanity may be discussed without necessary reference to the incarnation and death of Christ.[57] It is thus significant that the theologians of the *via moderna* tend to refer to Christ as *Legislator* rather than *Salvator*.[58] Whatever theological shortcomings this covenantal approach to Scripture may be deemed to exhibit, the fact remains that the theologians of the *via moderna* were able to exploit the *pactum* as both a soteriological and hermeneutical principle, establishing both the precondition for the justification of humanity, and a means of safeguarding the unity of Old and New Testaments.

The importance of this increasingly pervasive covenantal understanding of the relation between God and humanity with regard to the

intellectual origins of the Reformation will be evident. As we shall see, in the case of Luther, we find an understanding of the nature and function of the *pactum* which is at least continuous with, and probably also identical to, that of the *via moderna*. Similarly, Zwingli's *Reply to Hubmeier* of November 5, 1525 develops a strongly covenantal theology, laying emphasis upon the soteriological demands made of humanity, and the hermeneutical principle of the essential unity of both Old and New Testaments, similar to that associated with the *via moderna*.[59] Significantly, the concept of a *double* covenant between God and humanity, so characteristic of later Reformed theology, is not to be found in the first phase of the Reformation, which is characterized by an approach based upon a single covenant between God and humanity, exhibiting compelling parallels with the well-established theology of the *via moderna*. It is not clear whether these parallels are purely coincidental, or whether they reflect the direct or indirect influence (perhaps mediated through Luther?) of the *via moderna*. That they exist, however, is evident.

The second major development of significance in relation to the later medieval period is the rise of voluntarism, which may be illustrated with reference to the medieval discussion of merit.[60] The early Dominican and Franciscan schools adopted an *intellectualist* approach to the relation of the moral and meritorious realms, recognizing a direct correlation between the moral and the meritorious value of an act. The divine intellect is here understood to recognize the moral value of a human act, and to confer a corresponding meritorious value upon it, the transition between the two being effected by grace or charity. The use of terms such as *aequiparari*, *associatio*, *comparabilis*, and *proportionalis* in the discussion of this question indicates how initially the meritorious value of an act was understood to be directly correlated with its moral value: the divine intellect recognizes the latter, and the divine will thence effects the former. Thus Thomas Aquinas, who exemplifies this intellectualist understanding of the relationship between morality and merit, argued that merit is ultimately based upon justice.[61]

The origins of the voluntarist position may be traced back to Duns Scotus and William of Ockham, who emphasized the radical discontinuity between the moral and meritorious value of an act, with the latter being understood to rest entirely upon an uncoerced decision of the divine will. For Scotus, every created offering is worth exact what God accepts it for, and no more: "*dico, quod affine aliud a Deo ideo*

est bonum, quia a Deo volitum, et non est converso: sic meritum illud tantum bonum erat, pro quanta acceptabatur."[62] The meritorious value of an act need therefore bear no direct relation to its moral value, in that the *ratio meriti* is understood to lie in the divine will – more specifically, in the extrinsic denomination of the *acceptatio divina*. While the possibility that God may choose to correlate the meritorious with the moral value of an act cannot be excluded on *a priori* grounds, there is no necessary relationship between them.

This voluntarism is developed by William of Ockham,[63] for whom the decision as to what may be regarded as meritorious or demeritorious lies solely within the orbit of the divine will. lnevitably, this has exposed Ockham to the serious – and apparently irrefutable charge – that the relation between the moral and meritorious realm *de potentia ordinata* is ultimately arbitrary.[64] As Gabriel Biel pointed out, however, this danger is inevitable, unless God is to be made subject to created principles of morality, so that the divine will merely *endorses* rather than *effects* what is good and right. What is good is what is accepted as such by God.[65] The divine will is thus the chief arbiter and principle of justice, establishing justice by its decisions, rather than acting according to the basis of established justice. Indeed, a study of the meaning of *iustitia Dei*, the "righteousness of God," according to the theologians of the *via moderna*, indicates the totally arbitrary foundations of the concept: the "righteousness of God" is nothing more and nothing less than the embodiment of the arbitrary decisions of the divine will.[66] It is, nevertheless, important to note that – whatever the ultimate basis of divine law may be – it is understood to be a permanent and reliable aspect of the *potentia ordinata*, a fact that Biel underlines through the regular usage of such phrases as *de facto* or *stante lege* in place of the more usual *de potentia ordinata.* For Biel, the established moral order is to be found both in natural law and in the Old Testament law (that is, the Decalogue), as it is embodied within, and modified by, the New Testament (which Biel tends to treat as law). The voluntarism of the *via moderna* is thus linked to the Old and New Testaments. Furthermore, in that the origins of such views may be traced to Scotus, it is possible to argue that a section of the *via antiqua*, still in the ascendancy in certain Swiss and German universities in the early sixteenth century, adopted such a stance. The pervasiveness of such a voluntarism, both in ethics and theology, suggests an important degree of continuity between early Reformed theology and the late medieval tradition, in

that the early Reformed theology appears to demonstrate such a voluntarism. This point will be illustrated later in this chapter with reference to Calvin.

Our attention is next claimed by a question of great significance for Luther scholarship – the question of whether there existed a "medieval Augustinian tradition," either within the Augustinian Order or outside of it, and the nature and extent of its influence over the intellectual origins of the Reformation.

Schola Augustiniana Moderna

The suggestion that there existed in the later Middle Ages a coherent school of thought, espousing a theology significantly more "Augustinian" than that of the medieval theological schools as a whole, has exercised considerable fascination over generations of Reformation scholars. Was the young Luther familiar with such a school? Did his decisive theological insights derive from such a source? Were other Reformers also influenced in a similar manner? The unavailability of the necessary documentary sources until recently, and the concomitant absence of any general agreement over precisely what was meant by the term "Augustinian," might be thought to constitute such serious difficulties as to cause earlier generation of scholars to proceed with some caution in such a problematic area of historical research. In fact, however, two remarkably ambitious theories were put forward in the earlier part of the twentieth century.

In 1912, Alphons Victor Müller suggested that Luther was a representative of an "Augustinian" school of thought that existed in the late medieval period within the Augustinian Order.[67] In many respects, Müller's thesis was both premature and derivative, drawing heavily upon the work of Karl Werner, mediated through the writings of Carl Stange.[68] This thesis did not stand up to critical investigation, but was adopted in a significantly modified form by Eduard Stakemeier.[69] According to Stakemeier, a coherent theological tradition existed within the Augustinian Order in the later medieval period: in this respect, at least, Müller was correct. What Müller had failed to demonstrate was a plausible connection between such a tradition and the theology of Luther. According to Stakemeier, however, it was evident that the theologians of the Augustinian Order – particularly the general of the

Order, Girolamo Seripando – who were present at the Council of Trent's debates on justification, were heirs to precisely this tradition.[70]

This thesis has also not stood up to critical examination. First, Hubert Jedin pointed out that Stakemeier had limited himself to the primary sources assembled earlier by Müller, rather than developing and extending this pioneering work. More theologians needed to be studied before such an ambitious thesis could be taken seriously.[71] Second, it was noted that Stakemeier had not demonstrated *textual continuity* between the Augustinian theologians he had considered. To demonstrate the influence of theologians upon their successors, extensive source-critical work was required, a task impossible at that time (1937) through the lack of reliable editions of the necessary works. Finally, recent source-critical work has suggested that the evidence for an "Augustinian school" at the Council of Trent is unconvincing, and that it is no longer possible to speak of such a "school" at Trent in any meaningful sense of the word.[72]

The failure of these early studies of the question of the nature and characteristics of a putative "medieval Augustinian school" does not, however, invalidate subsequent and more informed analysis of the same question. In recent years, a significant degree of clarification has been achieved with regard to this question, largely through the publication of primary sources, which has important consequences for any understanding of the intellectual origins of the Reformation. In part, this clarification has resulted from an increasing precision in vocabulary, in that the term "Augustinian" has been recognized to be multivalent,[73] and to require strict definition if reliable conclusions are to be drawn on its basis. The term "Augustinian," for the purposes of this section, is defined with reference to the Augustinian Order. The critical issue is whether there existed a distinctive, well-defined school of theology within the Augustinian Order in the late medieval period, irrespective of whether the theological characteristics of such a putative school correspond to the teachings of Augustine himself or not.[74] It is, of course, entirely possible that such a school might have influence outside the Augustinian Order – for example, through the teaching activities of Augustinians such as Gregory of Rimini at Paris and elsewhere. Gregory of Rimini was noted for his fastidious use of sources, especially from Augustine, and was able to attack Peter Aureole for his faulty citations and quotations of Augustine at a number of critical junctures. Nevertheless, the question of whether such a school existed must be

investigated initially through an analysis of the writings of such Augustinian theologians themselves, and obviously takes precedence over the question of its possible influence. Let us therefore begin by considering the evidence for the existence of a distinct theological school within the Augustinian Order in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

In a careful study of Augustinian theologians in the fourteenth century, Damasus Trapp was able to demonstrate a significant degree of textual continuity within the Augustinian Order, essential to the hypothesis of a coherent school of thought within that Order.[75] Thus Giles of Rome, the leading thirteenth-century theologian of the Order, is cited with sufficient frequency (often being designated *doctor noster Aegidius*) to indicate that he was regarded as a theological authority by his followers within the Augustinian Order. Adolar Zumkeller argued that the early Augustinian school, sometimes referred to as the *schola Aegidiana*, was characterized by its Aristotelian-Thomist ontological foundations, linked with certain distinctive theological elements that were unquestionably due to the influence of Augustine himself.[76] As examples of such elements, Zumkeller points to the emphasis upon the priority of *caritas* and *gratia* in justification, both authentic elements of Augustine's theology of justification.

Although these considerations might be thought to indicate the existence of a reasonably coherent theological tradition within the Augustinian Order, both Trapp and Zumkeller pointed to factors that suggest the existence of *two* quite distinct traditions within the Order in the later medieval period. The polarization resulting within many university faculties of arts between the *via antiqua* and the *via moderna* in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was noted earlier in this chapter. In his study of fourteenth-century Augustinian theologians, Trapp noted the emergence of exactly the same polarization *within the Augustinian Order*. Both *antiqui* and *moderni* may be discerned within the Order during this period, the former characterized by their use of source-critical and the latter by logico-critical techniques. Trapp thus argued that the development of the medieval Augustinian tradition could be broken down into two broad periods. The earlier period of Augustinian theology may be regarded as having been initiated by Giles of Rome, including such theologians as Alexander of San Elpido, Robert Cowton, and William of Ware, and ending with the fourteenth-century theologian Thomas of Strasbourg. In epistemology and related matters, these theologians were realists, following the *via antiqua*. The

second period, which may be regarded as having been inaugurated by Gregory of Rimini, and continuing into the sixteenth century, is characterized at the philosophical level by the "nominalism" of the *via moderna*. On source-critical grounds, there are excellent reasons for concluding that the "nominalism" of the later Augustinian tradition derives directly from the *via moderna*. We have already noted, for example, the manner in which Gregory of Rimini's crucial theory of the *complexe significabile* derives from the *modernus* of Adam Wodeham.

Once this highly important hypothesis had been set out, evidence in its support began to accumulate. It proved possible to clarify still further the distinction between the earlier and later schools. Zumkeller noted that the elements in the earlier Augustinian tradition that derived from Augustine of Hippo himself were intensified in the later period, and noted in particular that the Augustinians after Gregory of Rimini tended to depend more on Augustine than upon Giles of Rome. In a study of the doctrines of justification associated with the medieval Augustinian tradition,[77] I argued that the tradition from Giles of Rome to Thomas of Strasbourg adopted a theology of justification characteristic of the early Dominican or Franciscan schools, whereas the later tradition, from Gregory onwards, tended to follow the later Franciscan school and the *via moderna*.[78] The intrinsicist and ontologically determined theology of justification associated with the earlier period came to be gradually replaced with the extrinsicist and deontologized theology of the later period. The later Augustinian tradition (exemplified by Gregory of Rimini, Hugolino of Orvieto, and Dionysius of Montina) appropriated a series of theological insights deriving from the *via moderna* – such as an epistemological nominalism, and the speculative tool of the dialectic between the two powers of God and the results of its application, such as the critique of the role of created habits in justification.[79] In particular, the later Augustinian tradition followed the *via moderna* in teaching the priority of acts over habits, so that the formal cause of both justification and merit came to be increasingly identified as the extrinsic denomination of the *acceptatio divina*, rather than the intrinsic denomination of the created habit of grace.[80] Furthermore, it was evident that there was a significant degree of textual continuity between, for example, Gregory, Hugolino, and Dionysius, indicating the development of a coherent theological tradition within the Augustinian Order. For such reasons as these, this school increasingly came to be designated the *schola Augustiniana moderna*.

Although there were considerable parallels between the *via moderna* and *schola Augustiniana moderna*, it should be appreciated that there were equally great divergences. Above all, the theologians of the *schola Augustiniana moderna* developed a ferociously anti-Pelagian theology of grace, including a theology of absolute double predestination, an emphasis upon the depravity of humanity, and the necessity of divine grace for morally good acts, which is far removed both from the soteriology of the *via moderna* and from the milder theology of the earlier Augustinian tradition from Giles of Rome to Thomas of Strasbourg. Heiko A. Oberman clarified the manner in which this radical Augustinian theology developed in the fourteenth century by demonstrating that a form of academic Augustinianism developed at both Oxford and Paris, practically simultaneously and probably independent of each other, based upon Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings.[81] In Oxford, the movement was centered upon Thomas Bradwardine, whose vigorous critique of Pelagianism *De causa Dei* appeared in 1344.[82] Although being forced to respond to theological issues current in the fourteenth century, Bradwardine seems determined to apply the earlier anti-Pelagian insights of Augustine wherever possible. For Bradwardine, Augustine was – like Paul before him – *gratiae laudator, gratiae magnificus ac strenuus propugnator.*[83] However, Bradwardine supports his anti-Pelagian theology with a metaphysical doctrine of divine omnipotence quite alien to Augustine, with the result that the total soteriological dependence of humanity upon God is seen as a consequence of human *creatureliness* rather than human *sinfulness*.[84] The Fall is thus not viewed as a watershed in the economy of salvation. It is for this reason that some have questioned whether Bradwardine may be viewed as "Augustinian" in the strict sense of the term, given the pivotal function of the Fall within Augustine's theology. It is difficult to assess the influence of Bradwardine upon the Reformation: the Hundred Years War isolated Oxford as a center of learning from the universities of the continent, and Bradwardine, as a secular priest, had no religious order to propagate his views. It is possible to argue for some limited influence of Bradwardine upon the Reformation through Wycliffe,[85] in that Luther knew – and approved of – Wycliffe's assertion (deriving from Bradwardine), condemned at the Council of Constance, that "*omnia de necessitate absoluta eveniunt.*"[86] However, it is the Parisian version of this academic Augustinianism, associated with Gregory of Rimini, that has attracted most scholarly attention since the twentieth century, and

which is of particular relevance in relation to the intellectual origins of the Reformation.

The fundamental difference between Gregory and Bradwardine is that the former managed to develop a theological stance similar to that embodied in Augustine's anti-Pelagian corpus within the context of the intellectual framework of the *via moderna*. In other words, Gregory follows the *via moderna* where Bradwardine followed the *via antiqua*, constructing a remarkable synthesis between two positions that at first sight might appear to be incompatible. Where Bradwardine's predestinarianism is the result of his metaphysical doctrine of divine omnipotence, Gregory's arises through his Christologically concentrated concept of salvation history.[87] As a result, Gregory is able to retain Augustine's emphasis upon the Fall as the decisive anthropological element in salvation history. It is almost certain that Bradwardine is *unus modernus doctor* singled out for criticism by Gregory on account of his un-Augustinian views on the Fall.[88] On the basis of the evidence available, it seems that an academic Augustinianism, based upon the anti-Pelagian writings of Augustine, linked to a conceptual framework essentially that of the *via moderna*, came to be transmitted within the Augustinian Order in the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, corresponding with the later Augustinian tradition identified by Trapp.[89]

The evidence points to at least a tradition, and probably a school,[90] of thought within the Augustinian Order in the later medieval period, deriving from Gregory of Rimini, although the precise nature and extent of its influence within and outside that Order remains unclear. It will also be clear why an earlier generation of scholars found themselves so confused by the characteristics of this school, and unable to distinguish it from the *via moderna*. The *schola Augustiniana moderna* – as this Gregorian tradition is generally known – adopted not merely the epistemology (that is, "nominalism") of the *via moderna*, but also certain characteristic aspects of the soteriology of that movement. These elements included the use of the dialectic between the two powers of God to demonstrate the secondary and contingent role of created habits, and the emphasis upon the extrinsic denomination of the *acceptatio divina* in justification. Yet, despite this remarkable convergence with the *via moderna*, the radically theocentric theology of Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings dominates the soteriology of the *schola Augustiniana moderna*, and distinguishes it from that of the *via moderna*.

This complex pattern of simultaneous convergence with and divergence from the *via moderna* highlights the inadequacy of the terms "nominalist" and "Augustinian" to designate these two rival schools of thought of the later medieval period. Not only did many "Augustinian" theologians adopt a "nominalist" epistemology, they also incorporated important elements of "nominalist" theories of justification into their own doctrines. It is precisely this variation between individual Augustinian theologians in respect of the extent to which they adopted elements of "nominalism" that has caused so much of the confusion currently surrounding the characteristics of a putative "Augustinian" school of theology at the time.

Furthermore, this intellectual traffic may have been two-way, rather than unidirectional: there are reasons for supposing that certain theologians of the *via moderna*, such as Pierre d'Ailly, may even be dependent upon Gregory of Rimini at points in matters of epistemology,[91] thus complicating still further an already confusing picture, and reinforcing the impression of two schools that are practically identical in matters of epistemology, yet diverge so radically in matters of soteriology. Within a university faculty of arts, such differences would have been insignificant: thus at Paris, Gregory of Rimini and William of Ockham were identified as the leading doctors of the *via nominalium* within the faculty of arts.[92] Within a university faculty of theology, however, the differences between the two schools would have been considerable. A question that will concern us at several points in the later sections of this chapter is this: was the *schola Augustiniana moderna* represented at the institutions at which the various Reformers were educated? And are there any reasons for supposing that it exercised any influence over the origins of their ideas?

Late Medieval Theology and the Origins of Reformed Theology

The relation of Zwingli to the late medieval theological schools has been the subject of considerable speculation. It is known that he was influenced by the *via antiqua* while at the university of Basle (1502–6), and that he possessed a heavily annotated copy of the 1503 Venice edition of Scotus's *Opus Oxoniense*, as well as some minor Scotist works.[93] This suggests early affinities with Scotism. In 1510, Glarean

wrote to Zwingli, indicating that he wished to leave Cologne and take up a post at Basle, where he might teach according to the *via seu secta Scoti*, and clearly suggesting that Zwingli approved of this *via*.[94] The possibility that Zwingli's theological formation was shaped by Scotism has recently been explored in considerable depth, and has proved important in clarifying the role of scholastic theology in catalyzing the emergence of the Reformed theological community.

In his careful study of Zwingli's annotations of the edition of Scotus's *Ordinatio* produced by the Italian Franciscan Filipo Bagnacavallo, Daniel Bolliger demonstrated that two distinct modes of reception could be identified.[95] In the "passive" or indirect mode of reception, Zwingli assimilated Scotist ideas indirectly, primarily through secondary sources. Our interest, however, focuses primarily on Zwingli's "active" mode of Scotus reception, which arose through a direct engagement with primary sources. Here, Zwingli shows himself to be especially interested in the idea of the divine infinity, and to have engaged with a number of issues that later became important in his sacramental theology. It is clear that Zwingli has appropriated some of Scotus's ideas, and that these would help shape aspects of his theology.

The fact that Zwingli incorporates a number of distinctive Scotist ideas into his theology is highly significant, especially to any study of the reception of Scotus in the early modern period. Yet it is essential to appreciate that Zwingli's *reforming* agenda does not appear to have been shaped to any significant extent by scholasticism. Zwingli's emergence as a Reformer, which dates from the 1510s, rests upon concerns that are clearly linked with a generally humanist, and increasingly a specifically *Erasmian*, agenda. The ideas that precipitated the Reformation at Zurich show no clear lines of continuity with late medieval scholasticism of any particular kind, whereas the stamp of Swiss humanism may readily be discerned at point after point. While there is little doubt that Zwingli's earlier thought demonstrates a Scotist tone, there is no evidence to suggest that these ideas shaped his reforming agenda, or crystallized his perceptions that some form of reformation was required. At most, one can conclude that Zwingli shifted position within an established scholastic matrix, devoid of any reformational associations.

The critical question concerns how Zwingli moved from a modestly Scotist outlook to an Erasmian reforming perspective – and that can only be answered by considering Zwingli's growing affinities with

Swiss humanist sodalities, and his increasing association with their nationalist, pacifist, and reformational agendas. Sociologically, Zwingli thus became a humanist "insider," which entailed a corresponding relinquishing of his modest scholastic background. To demonstrate Zwingli's early interest in Scotus and Scotism is of considerable interest in relation to the history of Scotus reception in the late Renaissance; it does not, however, help us account for the intellectual origins of the Reformation.

The influence of late medieval theological schools, such as the *via moderna* and *via antiqua*, upon John Calvin is much more difficult to assess, on account of the near-total absence of primary sources for the period 1523–34 in Calvin's career. It is clearly of crucial importance to a correct understanding of the origins of Calvin's religious thought that we know of his associations at the University of Paris in the 1520s. This information, however, is almost certainly lost to us through the events that were precipitated by the *affaire des placards* of 1534. Antoine Marcourt's highly polemical placards denouncing the mass, distributed and posted throughout France in the early morning of October 18, 1534,[96] brought to a head the simmering controversy between French catholics and *évangeliques*, and moved Francis I to implement his long-threatened campaign against "Lutheran" teachings in France. Those with evangelical views in France at the time were not prepared to argue the distinction between "Lutheran" and "evangelical," and preferred not to advertise their views publicly. The dangers of doing so had been discovered the previous November by Calvin, who had fled Paris for the relative safety of Angoulème in the aftermath of Nicolas Cop's controversial All Saints' Day oration. Within hours of his flight, the authorities had searched Calvin's rooms, and confiscated his personal papers.[97] These papers have never been traced or recovered, even in part, with the result that we possess no documents from Calvin's own hand relating to this crucially formative period in his career. Practically all our "knowledge" of Calvin's Paris period is nothing more than an educated guess, based upon circumstantial evidence.

To illustrate this point, let us consider the statement, common to most accounts of Calvin's early period, to the effect that he entered the Parisian Collège de la Marche in 1523 at the age of 14.[98] Two simple points may be made. First, we do not actually know that Calvin did, in fact, enter the Collège de la Marche prior to entering the Collège de Montaigu. In the first edition of his *Vie de Calvin*, Theodore de Bèze

omits any reference to this college from his account of Calvin's early Paris period, before stating that Calvin first went to the Collège de la Barbe. This reference comes at a later point in the biography, in a reference to the celebrated pedagogue Mathurin Cordier, who de Bèze describes as "s*on regent au collège de Saincte barbe a Paris en sa première jeunesse*."[99] This biography was, of course, written in some haste, in order to preempt more scurrilous accounts of Calvin's death, and prevent them from gaining any credibility: nevertheless, it remains the oldest account of Calvin's Paris period, and undoubtedly incorporates much material deriving from Calvin himself.

In the following year, Nicolas Colladon published a considerably more detailed biography of Calvin, including an expanded account of the Reformer's Paris period. It is in this account that we encounter, for the first time, the assertion that Calvin initially studied at the Collège de la Marche.[100] Beza later harmonized his earlier biography with Colladon's, dropping his reference to Sainte Barbe, and mentioning La Marche in connection with Cordier.[101] In fact, of course, we possess no statement from Calvin himself to the effect that he studied at La Marche; the closest approximation to any such affirmation is a late appreciative reference to Cordier as Calvin's teacher at Paris, without naming any specific college with which either Calvin or Cordier was associated.[102] We know that Cordier was engaged as a pedagogue by half a dozen Paris *collèges de plein exercice* at the time, including both La Marche and Sainte Barbe,[103] making it impossible to disprove Beza's early statement to the effect that Calvin first studied at Sainte Barbe.[104]

In his personal recollections of his Paris period, published in February 1564 (in other words, before Calvin's death and the subsequent biographies of de Bèze and Colladon), Cordier listed those colleges as including Reims, Lisieux, and Navarre, as well as both La Marche and Sainte-Barbe.[105] Such multiple affiliation of members of the teaching faculty was not unusual at Paris in the early sixteenth century: for example, in 1512 Alexis de Rantilly was a *bursarius* in theology at the Collège de Navarre, a regent in arts at the Collège de Bourgougne, and resident at the Collège de Tréguier. The formal transference of students between colleges at Paris was not an uncommon occurrence in the early sixteenth century. As far as can be established, this invariably happened for one of two reasons. In the first place, a student at one college might be awarded a bursary (or similar academic award or promotion) at another. About 20 colleges are known to have awarded

bursaries to those studying theology, including Montaigu. The Collège de Sorbonne allowed students to attend initial probationary period on a paying basis as *hospites*; if it approved of their progress, they might be elected as fellows (*socii*) and given board and lodging free of charge. A student at a smaller college (such as La Marche) might move college to take up a bursary at a larger college (such as the Sorbonne, Navarre, or Harcourt). Calvin might thus have begun at La Marche or Sainte-Barbe, only to be offered a bursary at Montaigu. Sainte-Barbe, a relatively new college, was unable to offer bursaries of any kind until 1525, when Diogo de Gouveia managed to persuade the King of Portugal to provide bursaries for Portuguese students.

Second, there are no compelling reasons for supposing that Calvin actually did begin his studies at Paris at the age of 14. The suggestion that Calvin undertook his initial studies at this age may be traced back to Emile Doumergue,[106] who in turn bases his statement upon a somewhat tendentious paper of 1621,[107] which interprets an entry in the Noyon registers of August 5, 1523 (stating that Calvin's father had been given permission to send him away from Noyon until October) as implying that Calvin went to Paris for the first time that autumn. This conclusion is simply not demanded by the evidence. Fourteen was late by the standards of the period to begin a university education,[108] and if Calvin even approached the precocious intelligence with which his biographers credit him, he would have been capable of the university curriculum at 12.[109] This possibility, of course, does not permit the conclusion that he *did* begin his studies at this age: the point is made merely to emphasize how little we know of Calvin's Paris period with anything even approaching certainty.

It is also unclear precisely what Calvin studied during his period at Paris. In a rare autobiographical reflection, Calvin indicates that his father had always intended him to study theology.[110] This does not, however, allow us to conclude that he ever began such studies while at Paris, and there are excellent reasons for supposing that his formal education progressed no further than attending lectures in philosophy.[111] There are also reasons for supposing that Calvin's theological education may derive largely from personal study or reading during his Paris period;[112] if this is so, he could easily have encountered ideas outside of the formal teaching offered at Paris, which would diminish considerably the relevance of the formal university theological curriculum to his development.

The identity of Calvin's teachers during his Paris period is also shrouded in obscurity. With the single exception of Cordier, Calvin does not name any individual who taught him at Paris, although it is possible to argue that several confused references to Spaniards in the early biographies[113] may rest upon Calvin's reminiscences of the celebrated Spanish dialectician Antonio Coronel, whose *Rosarium logices* was published at Paris in 1510, and who appears to have taught at the Collège de Montaigu during Calvin's time there.[114] Here, however, as with so many other aspects of the Paris period, Calvin's development must be regarded as an enigma.

The absence of sufficient reliable information pertaining to Calvin's intellectual development to permit analysis of that development forces the historian to adopt one of two courses, and explicitly acknowledge that this is the case. In that the necessary materials for such an analysis are unavailable, it must be concluded that nothing can be said with any degree of certainty. Alternatively, the historian may proceed on the basis of an inferential analysis, drawing upon circumstantial evidence to establish conclusions of varying degrees of probability. In fact, the historian has little choice other than to adopt the second course and, conceding that little can be known with any degree of certainty concerning the Paris period (when did it begin? who taught Calvin? what did he study?), proceed to infer from the available evidence (including Calvin's later writings) what *might* have happened, while conceding the provisional and tentative character of any conclusions that may result. In employing the latter method, I would emphasize that I am adopting the only approach to the Paris period possible, given the absence of proper sources, and have no intention of constructing a major hypothesis upon the basis of such fragmentary evidence. First, let us consider the intellectual climate at Paris in the early sixteenth century.

The fourteenth century had seen the conflict between *via antiqua* and *via moderna*, so characteristic of late medieval university life, polarize academic opinion within the university of Paris. The Parisian faculty of arts attempted to stem the growing influence of the *via moderna* early in the fourteenth century: on December 29, 1340, a statute condemning the *mores Ockanicorum* took effect:[115] henceforth, any candidate wishing to supplicate for the degree of Master of Arts at Paris would have to swear to observe these statutes *contra scientia Okamicam*, and abstain from teaching such doctrines to his pupils.[116] By the end of the century, however, the ineffectiveness of the measures

was evident: Pierre d'Ailly (1350–1420), a noted *modernus*, became rector of the Collège de Navarre in 1384, and chancellor of the university five years later.[117] By the second decade of the sixteenth century, the Collège de Montaigu – to which Calvin went up at some indeterminate point in the following decade – had become a stronghold of the *via moderna* in a university no longer inclined to oppose the movement.[118]

Even during his brief sojourn at Montaigu during the closing years of the previous century, Erasmus had compiled a list of theological concerns at Paris that demonstrates precisely the issues that were debated within the *via moderna*.[119] Two such questions may be noted. First, can God undo the past, such as by making a prostitute into a virgin?[120] The question of whether God can undo the past was regarded as significant by the theologians of both the *via moderna* and *schola Augustiniana moderna*, raising the difficult question of future contingents and the relation between the *potentia absoluta* and *potentia ordinata*.[121] Second, Erasmus reports heated theological debates over whether God could have become a beetle or a cucumber, instead of a human being.[122] There is ample documentary evidence that the theologians of the *via moderna* debated the question of whether God could have assumed the nature of an ass, or a stone, instead of a human being. It is in this form that Calvin encountered the question.[123] As we have shown elsewhere, the question at stake in this apparently pointless disputation related to the nature of the hypostatic union, particularly the concept of "personification." For Ockham, the nature of the hypostatic union was such that the assumed nature need not itself be rational. In clarifying the relation of the divine and human *personae* in the incarnation, Ockham argues that the divine *persona* is able to supply rationality, which need not be presupposed to exist in the entity which is thus assumed in the incarnation.[124] Thus God could have assumed the nature of an ass or a stone (or, indeed, a beetle or a cucumber) without logical contradiction. The point is evident in the discussion of the question by many Parisian theologians of the *via moderna*, such as John Major.[125]

It is this figure of John Major that has attracted considerable attention on the part of Calvin scholars in recent decades, partly due to the so-called "Reuter hypothesis." In an important study of 1963, Karl Reuter claimed that Calvin was taught by John Major while at Paris, and that the distinguished Scottish theologian exercised a decisive

influence over the formation of the young Frenchman's theology.[126] In particular, Reuter claimed that Major introduced Calvin to a "new conception of anti-Pelagian and Scotist theology."[127] Although earlier studies had suggested merely that Major taught Calvin, possibly introducing him to some form of "Ockhamism,"[128] Reuter developed this suggestion into a major working hypothesis of Calvin research. According to Reuter, it was through the influence of Major that Calvin encountered the writings of Augustine, Bonaventure, Duns Scotus, Thomas Aquinas, Thomas Bradwardine, and Gregory of Rimini.[129] This thesis is clearly of considerable importance in relation to the question of the origins of Calvin's reforming theology, and has been the subject of extended evaluation.

Initially, the thesis appears to have met with something approaching uncritical acceptance.[130] More careful studies suggested there was indeed an epistemological affinity between Major and Calvin,[131] although such views concerning intuitive and abstractive knowledge would not be sufficient to demonstrate a specific influence of Major upon Calvin (given their pervasive influence within the Parisian faculty of arts as a whole at the time). Nor, indeed, would it allow any conclusion concerning Major's specifically *theological* influence on Calvin to be drawn, in that the matters in question were discussed within the faculty of arts, rather than that of theology. The hypothesis has, however, subsequently been subjected to considerable criticism, most notably by Alexandre Ganoczy.[132] The following two points made by Ganoczy against Reuter are of particular importance. First, although Ganoczy concedes that Calvin may have read Major's *Commentary on the Sentences* during the period 1540–59, there is no textual evidence in the first edition of the *Institutio* (1536) to warrant the conclusion that he had read the work before 1536. Reuter had based his conclusions upon the 1559 edition of the *Institutio*, which Ganoczy felt was questionable as a means of determining the origins of his ideas historically. Second, in the first edition of the *Institutio*, Calvin tends to identify scholastic theology primarily with the writings of Gratian and Peter Lombard.[133] Thus there are some 35 references to the Lombard in this edition, and no references whatsoever to any theologian of the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries, irrespective of theological orientation. In addition, of course, it will be obvious that, if Calvin's entry to Paris is to be dated as early as 1521, the possibility of his being taught by Major requires reevaluation, in that the latter was absent from Paris until 1525.

Although Reuter's hypothesis, in its original form, is probably untenable, it would seem that the criticism of Ganoczy and others requires at most the modification, rather than the rejection, of the underlying suggestion that Calvin has been influenced by currents of thought prevalent in the late medieval period – exemplified by, but by no means restricted to, Major. For example, Reuter points to six aspects of Calvin's religious thought that may reasonably be held to be due to late medieval influence:[134] while they need not point directly to Major, they certainly point to the thought-world of the *via moderna* or *schola Augustiniana moderna* in general. Similar comments apply to the observation that Calvin is familiar with the *modus loquendi theologicus* of the late medieval period.[135]

The Parisian faculty of arts recognized three *viae* in the late medieval period: the *via sancti Thomae, via Scoti*, and *via nominalium*,[136] and identified two recognized representatives of this last *via* – William of Ockham and Gregory of Rimini.[137] This immediately suggests that the epistemological "nominalism" or "terminism" so characteristic of both the *via moderna* and *schola Augustiniana moderna* was officially recognized and present within the Paris faculty of arts at the time. Even if his studies progressed no further than the *trivium*, Calvin could scarcely have avoided such logical and epistemological questions. The favorable reference to a dialectically minded Spaniard in Beza's biography is significant, whether he is to be identified with Antonio Coronel or not, in that it points to Calvin's formal encounter with dialectics at this stage in his career, and hence almost certainly to the "nominalism" that was so pervasive a feature of the period at the Collège de Montaigu. The distinctively terminist foundations and dialectical structure of Calvin's thought have frequently been noted,[138] and corresponds well with this aspect of his university education.

It is therefore necessary to point out that Calvin may have absorbed much of the dialectical outlook of either the *via moderna* or the *schola Augustiniana moderna* during his Paris period, without any need to specifically attach this influence to any one named individual. There is no need to posit personal contact between Calvin and Major in order to affirm that the former was influenced by a general theological trend that is exemplified by the latter. Earlier, we stressed the weakness of the concept of the "Forerunner of the Reformation," in that it partly rested on the assumption that influence took place at the level of socially detached individual thinkers. This same vulnerability attends

Reuter's thesis, in its original form. But it is not necessary to suppose any such personal contact or influence between Calvin and Major; the issue concerns what currents of thought were present, and the manner in which Calvin encountered and the extent to which he appropriated them.

An alternative explanation of such parallels has been put forward by H. A. Oberman, who suggests that Calvin could forge his own personal "Augustinian" theology without any interaction with the scholastic tradition in general, or the scholastic reception of Augustine in particular.[139] This is a thoroughly unsatisfactory hypothesis, which is obliged to posit that Calvin should coincidentally reproduce a theology which is remarkably similar to that of the *schola Augustiniana moderna* without having any familiarity with the broad outlines of the distinctive ideas of the movement. Happenstance is an unsatisfactory scholarly tool, especially when there are such clear and plausible alternatives available.

A more serious objection to Ganoczy's dismissal of Reuter's hypothesis concerns the nature of the 1536 *Institutio* itself, and may best be appreciated by considering the very different situations faced by Luther and Calvin. Luther, writing some 20 years earlier than Calvin, was obliged to deal directly with what he regarded to be the most significant threat to the gospel as he perceived it – and Luther identified this threat, whether rightly or wrongly, as deriving from the theology of the *via moderna*. Luther was therefore obliged to engage directly with the leading representatives of this theology,[140] and mount a point-by-point refutation of their views. The Lutheran Reformation originated as a *university* reforming movement in an academic context, initially fighting an essentially academic battle against the dominant trends in the local academic culture – in this case, the *via moderna* – until the intervention of the humanist movement turned a minor local academic debate into a major cosmopolitan ecclesiastical confrontation. Thus Karlstadt's 151 Augustinian theses of 1517 or Luther's *Disputatio contra scholasticam theologiam* of the same year were aimed, not at the church, but at an academic theological movement, initiating an essentially academic debate that was conducted in academic terms in an academic context. As this chapter will emphasize, the origins of the Reformed church appear to owe little, if anything, to such a university dispute: the early polemical literature of the Lutheran church, particularly in the period 1517–20, cannot therefore be permitted to serve as a model for that of the later Reformed church, in the period 1536–9.

I would address the following question to Ganoczy: why should Calvin wish to, or need to, make any sort of reference to *any* late medieval theologian, let alone one as obscure as Major, in the 1536 edition of the *Institutio*? The work was intended as both as a defense of the orthodoxy of the evangelical movement against its French critics (particularly after the *affaire des placards*) and as a religious primer – not as an attack on the theology of the later medieval period. If any Lutheran work serves as a model for the *Institutio*, it is the Catechisms, rather than the academic disputations.[141] Furthermore, scholastic theology posed no serious threat to the emerging Reformed church – the most serious difficulty appears to have been posed by religious ignorance and indifference, requiring a pedagogical, rather than a polemical, response. A systematic and attractive presentation of doctrine, rather than a sustained debate with certain named and extensively cited late medieval theologians, was required. Where Luther's primary concern was the radical critique of the (allegedly) Pelagian soteriologies of the *via moderna*, Calvin's primary concern appears to have been the radical critique of the ecclesiology underlying the late medieval church.[142] Rather than engage in extensive debate with late medieval writers, Calvin employs the standard Melanchthonian device of discrediting the medieval era as a whole by a direct attack upon the *fons et origo* of its ecclesiology – Gratian and Peter Lombard.[143] Thus Calvin's references to Peter Lombard in the 1536 *Institutio utio* are, without exception, drawn from the fourth book of the *Libri quattuor sententiarum*, dealing with the doctrines of the church and sacraments.[144] Calvin, by attacking a stream of tradition at its source, relieves himself of the necessity of dealing with subsequent developments, and opens the way to a premedieval ecclesiology more conducive to his reforming activities. At no point is it necessary, or even useful, for Calvin to engage in debate with any representatives of late medieval religious thought – and to suggest that this silence reflects an absence of familiarity with such sources, or that it indicates that Calvin has not been influenced by them to any significant extent, is simply a *non sequitur*. The question of the significance of Calvin's *use* of theological sources is secondary to a discussion of Calvin's religious concerns, literary and polemical techniques, and potential audiences. I would therefore wish to emphasize that the absence of specific references in the writings of Calvin to named late medieval theologians – such as Gregory of Rimini or John Major – cannot be taken as implying an ignorance of their views, or an

absence of continuity with them. The possibility that Calvin may have defensively minimized his continuity with certain late medieval writers for polemical reasons cannot be excluded.

Perhaps, then, Reuter's thesis – that Calvin learned a "new conception of anti-Pelagian and Scotist theology, and a renewed Augustinianism" at Paris[145] – may be restated in terms of the influence of a late medieval theological current – or even a *Bewegung*, to use a nuanced term – rather than of a *specific individual* (i.e., John Major). The leading characteristics of the epistemology and theology of the *schola Augustiniana moderna*, exemplified by Gregory of Rimini, may be set out as follows:

1 A strict epistemological "nominalism" or "terminism."
2 A voluntarist, as opposed to intellectualist, understanding of the *ratio meriti*.
3 The extensive use of the writings of Augustine, particularly his anti-Pelagian works.
4 A strongly pessimistic view of original sin, with the Fall being identified as a watershed in the economy of salvation.
5 An emphasis upon the priority of God in justification, linked to a doctrine of special grace.
6 A radical doctrine of absolute double predestination.

These six features are also leading aspects of the thought of John Calvin (not to mention others that are shared by the *via moderna* and *schola Augustiniana moderna*, such as the rejection of the implication of created habits of grace in justification or merit). Oberman's proposal requires that Calvin derived these specific ideas without reference to prevailing notions – an idea that seems to reflect Immanuel Kant's long-discredited philosophical idea that individual thinkers remained detached from and uninfluenced by their social context.

The second of these six points may be singled out for further discussion. Earlier in the present chapter, we noted how the later medieval tradition as a whole (including the later Franciscan school, the *via moderna* and *schola Augustiniana moderna*) adopted a strongly voluntarist approach to the basis of merit.[146] This observation applies equally to the merits of Christ as to human merit. Scotus's maxim, that the value of an offering is determined solely by the divine will, was generally accepted: "*dico, quod affine aliud a Deo, ideo est bonum, quia a Deo volitum, en non*

est converso: sic meritum illud tantum bonum erat, pro quanta acceptabatur."[147] In the *Institutio*, Calvin adopts an identical position in relation to the merit of Christ. Although this is implicit in earlier editions of the work, it is only made explicit in the 1559 edition, in the aftermath of Calvin's correspondence with Laelius Socinus over the issue.[148] In 1555, Calvin responded to questions raised by Socinus concerning the merit of Christ and the assurance of faith,[149] and appears to have incorporated these replies into the 1559 edition of the *Institutio* without significantly modifying them. In the course of this correspondence, the strongly voluntarist approach that Calvin adopts to the *ratio meriti Christi* becomes obvious. Calvin makes clear that the basis of Christ's merit is not located in the intrinsic value of Christ's offering of himself (which would correspond to an intellectualist approach to the *ratio meriti Christi*), but in the divine decision to accept such an offering as of sufficient merit for the redemption of humankind (which corresponds to the voluntarist approach). For Calvin, "apart from God's good pleasure, Christ could not merit anything" (*nam Christus nonnisi ex Dei beneplacito quidquam mereri potuit*).[150] The continuity between Calvin and the late medieval voluntarist tradition in general at this point will be evident.

In the past, this similarity between Calvin and Scotus has been taken to imply the direct influence of Scotus on Calvin, or perhaps an indirect influenced mediated via Socinus: thus Alexander Gordon argued that Calvin adopted a Scotist approach to the *ratio meriti Christi*, and on the basis of his presupposition that Scotism constituted the basis of Socinianism, traced the continuous development of that movement from Scotus through Calvin.[151] That this view is deeply problematic at every level will be obvious; nevertheless, an important point has been made – that there is an affinity between Calvin and Scotus that requires an explanation. As we have argued, however, Calvin's continuity appears to be with the late medieval voluntarist tradition *as a whole*, deriving from William of Ockham and Gregory of Rimini, in relation to which Scotus marks an important point of transition. No reason may be given for the meritorious nature of Christ's sacrifice, save that God benevolently ordained to accept it as such. The continuity of Calvin with this later tradition is evident, whatever its explanation may be.

These six features of the *schola Augustiniana moderna* noted above clearly include those aspects of Calvin's thought identified by Reuter, and attributed to the influence of John Major.[152] It is indeed possible

that Major had influenced Calvin at this point; yet it is also possible that both Major and Calvin had absorbed and been influenced by the general theological voluntarism of the era, evident in writings as diverse as those of Scotus, Ockham, and Gregory of Rimini – the latter two of whom were well-established intellectual presences at Paris. It is perhaps significant that, in the preface to his *Commentary on the Sentences*, Major explicitly acknowledges his debt to three theologians: none other than Duns Scotus, William of Ockham, and Gregory of Rimini.[153] It is certainly therefore a remarkable coincidence, to say the least, that Calvin should reproduce the leading features of an academic Augustinianism which developed at the same university as that which he himself attended, if he had not himself been familiar with such theological currents, whether directly or indirectly. It is not necessary to suppose that Calvin encountered these views in formal philosophical or theological lectures:[154] Gregory's *Commentary* went through three editions at Paris (1482, 1487, 1520), the last appearing shortly before Calvin's arrival.[155] If Calvin read as widely as we are led to believe by his contemporaries, it is not improbable that this work – a standard of both logic and theology by one of the two recognized doctors of the *via nominalium* at Paris – would have attracted his attention. Reuter, of course, put forward his thesis before the *schola Augustiniana moderna* had been identified and characterized, and his theory is considerably weakened through unnecessary subsidiary hypotheses (such as personal contact between Calvin and Major). I would therefore suggest that the relation of the young Calvin to the *schola Augustiniana moderna* at Paris is potentially a fruitful area of Reformation scholarship.

This point may be developed by considering the origins of the religious thought of Peter Martyr Vermigli. Probably in 1516, Vermigli entered the Augustinian Order at Fiesole, moving to Padua in 1519.[156] It seems that a well-established academic school, based upon the writings of Gregory of Rimini, existed in northern Italy in the first two decades of the sixteenth century, particularly associated with Paolo da Soncino and his pupil Gaspare Mansueti da Perugia,[157] and that this school was encountered by Vermigli. Furthermore, the Augustinian house at Padua was described by a contemporary of Vermigli as a "*roccaforte dell'agostinismo*,"[158] and there are good reasons for believing this judgment to be reliable. Vermigli's first biographer records his preference for "the school divines, speciallie *Thomas* [Aquinas], and *Ariminensis* [Gregory of Rimini]."[159] Four editions of Gregory's *Commentary* were published in

northern Italy (Milan, 1494; Venice, 1503, 1518 and 1522), suggesting considerable interest in the views of the great Augustinian theologian at Padua and elsewhere.[160]

The obvious question arising from these observations is the following: was Vermigli influenced by the *schola Augustiniana moderna?* The circumstantial evidence is highly suggestive. Vermigli was a member of the Augustinian Order, and appears to have both encountered and responded positively to the views of Gregory of Rimini. Furthermore, it is evident that Vermigli adopted all the leading features of the theology of the *schola Augustiniana moderna* noted above in the course of our discussion of Calvin's possible relation to this school (although it should be noted that it is difficult to establish whether Vermigli's logic and epistemology are strictly terminist). Once more, a remarkable degree of coincidence must be conceded if this is not the case. It is difficult to argue for the influence of Calvin, for example, in trying to explain how these ideas came to be present in Vermigli's writings.[161] Although much work still remains to be done on Vermigli's relation to late medieval thought, the clarification of the relationship between his soteriology and that of Gregory of Rimini is clearly of considerable interest and importance.[162] Where Stakemeier argued for a medieval Augustinian school in Italy that influenced Seripando, perhaps there is a stronger case for such an Italian school to be made in the case of Vermigli – raising, of course, the possibility that other figures – such as Girolamo Zanchi – may also have been influenced by such a school. This question, however, awaits clarification.[163]

This discussion has considered the possible influence of late medieval theology upon the intellectual origins of Reformed theology. Although the further investigation of the relation between Gregory of Rimini and the origins of the distinctive ideas of Calvin and Vermigli is clearly important in this respect, the evidence to date is more suggestive than conclusive. It is nevertheless clear that both Calvin and Vermigli independently exhibit remarkable continuity with the leading features of an academic Augustinianism characteristic of the late medieval period, no matter what the explanation of this continuity may eventually prove to be. The previous chapter drew attention to the considerable influence of humanism in relation to the intellectual origins of the Reformed church, and it seems that this conclusion must, at present, stand. There is no doubt that late medieval scholastic doctrines, both philosophical and theological, are to be found within the writings of Zwingli, Calvin,

and Vermigli, and that these have molded at least some of their distinctive ideas, perhaps most significantly in relation to the theme of the power of God.

We must now turn to consider the question of the impact of late medieval scholasticism upon the intellectual origins of the Lutheran Reformation.

Late Medieval Theology and the Origins of Lutheran Theology

In turning to deal with the origins of the distinctive theology of the Lutheran Reformation, the primary consideration must be the question of the relationship of Martin Luther to late medieval thought. It is, however, important to appreciate from the outset that neither the intellectual origins of the Reformation as a whole, nor even those of the reforming theology within the Wittenberg theological faculty in the period 1515–19, can be discussed with *exclusive* reference to the question of the origins of Luther's theological insights. Assumptions of this sort are frequently implicit in the earlier literature, but the complexity of the situation at the time precludes such simplistic generalizations. To explain the origins of Luther's ideas or reforming vocation is not to explain the origins of the Reformation *tout simple*.[164] Nevertheless, the question of the origins of Luther's distinctive theology over the period 1513–19 is clearly of enormous interest, whatever the relation of this theology to the emergence of the Wittenberg Reformation must ultimately be acknowledged to be. The first consideration in this discussion must therefore be the academic currents that Luther encountered during his theological education.

In 1505, Luther entered the Augustinian house at Erfurt, where he began the study of theology under the direction of his superiors in the Augustinian Order. Although Carl Stange argued that the taking of such monastic orders would imply the canonical recognition of the theological authority of Giles of Rome and Gregory of Rimini,[165] it is now recognized that this rests upon a simple misunderstanding.[166] However, in view of the fact that the *schola Augustiniana moderna* has now been identified and characterized as a significant theological current in the late medieval Augustinian Order, it might be thought that an excellent case may be made for Luther encountering such currents,

either at Erfurt or Wittenberg, and appropriating and shaping them for his own purposes. As Oberman states this suggestion:

> We can point to the *schola Augustiniana moderna*, initiated by Gregory of Rimini, reflected by Hugolino of Orvieto, apparently spiritually alive in the Erfurt Augustinian monastery, and transformed into a pastoral reform-theology by Staupitz, as the *occasio proxima* – not the *causa*! – for the inception of the *vera theologia* at Wittenberg.[167]

This suggestion is clearly of considerable importance, and requires careful evaluation. In what follows, I shall suggest that no case may be made for Luther having encountered such an Augustinian school at any point prior to 1519.

Although it is clear that Luther began his theological studies under the guidance of Erfurt Augustinian masters, there is no evidence to connect these masters with the *schola Augustiniana moderna*. As Hermelink pointed out in a seminal essay, there is evidence that the theologians of religious orders tended to be influenced by theological currents prevalent in their local university. Thus at Cologne, where the university was dominated by the *via antiqua* in the early sixteenth century, the local Dominican theologians appear to have regarded Thomas Aquinas as their master, whereas in Vienna and Erfurt, where the *via moderna* was dominant, they recognized the rival authority of William of Ockham.[168]

A similar observation may be made concerning the Augustinian house at Erfurt, in which the influence of the *via moderna* is evident at every point.[169] Thus Luther's teachers Johannes Nathin and Bartholomaus Arnoldi of Usingen were both noted exponents of the *via moderna*.[170] Arnoldi's doctrine of justification in particular is practically indistinguishable from that of Gabriel Biel.[171] Luther had studied within the faculty of arts at Erfurt prior to entering the local Augustinian priory, and would thus almost certainly have encountered both Arnoldi and Jodocus Trutvetter at this earlier stage.[172] The influence of both these representatives of the *via moderna* upon the Erfurt faculty of arts was considerable, particularly after the celebrated "quodlibetal disputation" of 1497, generally regarded as marking a point of transition in the history of that faculty.[173] Trutvetter's commitment to the *via moderna* is established beyond question,[174] and Luther's appointment thus points to a perceived degree of affinity between Luther and Trutvetter's circle. The influence of the *via moderna* upon Luther while at Erfurt is further

indicated by the fact that Luther later frequently demonstrated first-hand familiarity with Gabriel Biel's *Lectura super canonem missae* and *Collectorium circa quattuor sententiarum libros*, both of which he would have encountered while studying theology at the Erfurt priory. In marked contrast, Luther does not appear to have had knowledge of the writings of Gregory of Rimini until 1519[175] – a serious difficulty for those who suggest that he encountered a school of thought based upon Gregory's writings at this early stage.

In the autumn of 1508, Luther arrived at Wittenberg to take up the chair of moral philosophy within the university faculty of arts. A major alteration to the statutes of that faculty had taken place earlier that year, under the supervision of Christoph Scheurl.[176] From its foundation, Wittenberg demonstrated a marked bias towards the *via antiqua*. In the *Rotulus* of May 1507, lectures within the faculty of arts were carefully distinguished on the basis of whether they were *in via sancti Thomae* or *in via Scoti*.[177] This commitment to the two traditional schools within the *via antiqua* is corroborated by the important contemporary dialog of Andreas Meinhardi, which makes reference to both major schools of the *via antiqua*, while making no mention of any factions associated with the *via moderna*.[178] The tension between *via antiqua* and *via moderna*, so characteristic of many German universities in the late fifteenth century, does not appear to have surfaced at Wittenberg in the first five years of its existence. This situation, however, appears to have altered irreversibly in 1508 – the year of Luther's arrival.

In the autumn of 1507, Christoph Scheurl was succeeded as rector of the University of Wittenberg by Jodocus Trutvetter, who had recently left Erfurt. The arrival of so noted a *modernus* – who regarded Jean Buridan and Gabriel Biel as his intellectual mentors[179] – at Wittenberg, along with his elevation to the prestigious position of rector, suggests that the scene was set for a fundamental challenge to be posed to the prevailing ascendancy of the *via antiqua*. This challenge appears to have taken the form of the revised statutes for the faculty of arts of 1508. The new *statuta collegii artistarum* defined three *viae* according to whose methods and doctrines members of the faculty of arts were permitted to teach. In addition to the two main *viae* of the *via antiqua* (that is, the *via Thomae* and *via Scoti*), a third *via* was now specified: the *via Gregorii*.[180] It is clear that the reference is to Gregory of Rimini – but are we to understand this as a reference to the *via moderna*, or *the schola Augustiniana moderna*?

In an important essay, Oberman argued that the statutes of 1508 established officially the presence of the *schola Augustiniana moderna* within the Wittenberg faculty of arts.[181] The implications of this suggestion are considerable, in that the origins of Luther's reforming theology could be investigated with reference to an academic Augustinianism newly established at Wittenberg. In my opinion Oberman's suggestion cannot be sustained, and the older view – that *via Gregorii* is simply a local synonym for the *via moderna* – is essentially correct.[182] The following points seem to be conclusive.

1 The *via moderna* was known by various synonyms at the time. Thus at Heidelberg, it was referred to as the *via Marsiliana*, after Marsilius of Inghen.[183] It is interesting to note that Marsilius refers to Gregory as *magister noster*,[184] indicating the affinity between the two thinkers, and their joint claims to represent the *via moderna*. The growing recognition of the points of contact between Gregory of Rimini and Gabriel Biel should also be noted in this connection.[185]
2 There are well-established precedents for universities adopting the practice of defining three *viae*, of which two represent the *via antiqua*, and the third the *via moderna*. An excellent example is provided by Paris, which stipulated that members of the university faculty of arts could teach according to "*via sancti Thomae, via Scoti et via nominalium*."[186] Significantly, two doctors are noted in connection with the *via nominalium*: William of Ockham and Gregory of Rimini.[187] Given this pattern, a reference in the Wittenberg statutes to the *via Gregorii* alongside the *via Thomae* and *via Scoti* would appear to suggest that the *via moderna* is intended. It is also important to note at this point that there is manuscript evidence to suggest that some early versions of the Wittenberg statutes of 1508 refer to the *via Guilelmi* rather than *via Gregorii*.[188] Given the Parisian bracketing of William of Ockham and Gregory of Rimini as the recognized doctors of the *via nominalium*, this would point inexorably to an intended reference to the *via moderna*, rather than the *schola Augustiniana moderna*.
3 Christoph Scheurl himself appears to have been aware of one major academic school, in addition to the *via Thomae* and *via Scoti*, and to have regarded Jodocus Trutvetter as its representative at Wittenberg. Thus in a letter of August 12, 1513, he refers to Trutvetter as *modernorum princeps*,[189] clearly implying his affinity with – and, indeed,

local preeminence within – the *via moderna*. In view of the fact that Trutvetter was rector of the university at the time at which the revisions were being drawn up, and a close personal friend of Scheurl (evident from their correspondence), the possibility that Scheurl intended the *via* associated with Trutvetter to be permitted within the faculty of arts can hardly be overlooked.

4 It must be remembered that these statutes pertain to the faculty of *arts*, not the autonomous higher faculty of *theology*. It has been emphasized in the present chapter that, viewed from the standpoint of the subject matter of the faculty of arts, the methods and views of the *via moderna* and *schola Augustiniana moderna* are practically indistinguishable (so that Gregory may legitimately be referred to as *antesignanus nominalistarum*).[190] A reference to Gregory within the context of the curriculum of the faculty of *arts* concerns his *epistemology*, not his *soteriology*. The soteriological differences that are so evident between Gregory of Rimini and Pierre d'Ailly or Gabriel Biel would not have been encountered in this context.

It would therefore appear reasonable to suggest that Luther went to Wittenberg, possibly as a representative of the *via moderna*, to a university faculty of arts that had recently (and belatedly, by the standards of the day) recognized this *via*. The suggestion that *via Gregorii* is a synonym for the *schola Augustiniana moderna* simply does not appear to be justified by the evidence. In any case, Oberman appears to have withdrawn this suggestion in more recent writings, without drawing attention to this significant retraction.[191] This does not, however, permit us to conclude that Luther did not actually encounter the *schola Augustiniana moderna* at Wittenberg; it is simply to point out that this school of thought does not appear to have been officially recognized by the University of Wittenberg, and authorized to be taught within the faculty of arts. Luther could have come across this school of thought in a variety of indirect manners. One such possibility is that Luther encountered precisely this movement in the person of Johannes von Staupitz, his superior and mentor within the Augustinian order.[192]

Three major difficulties attend this intriguing suggestion. First, it is impossible to establish the precise nature of Staupitz's influence upon Luther with any degree of certainty.[193] A number of factors conspire to cause this difficulty.[194] Staupitz's influence over Luther appears to have been at its greatest in the period 1510–12, for which we have practically

no literary evidence relating to either individual. Thus there is no surviving literary evidence to indicate that Luther ever heard Staupitz preach or lecture, let alone to indicate the influence that the latter might thence have exercised over the former. This influence appears to have been exercised through private pastoral conversations, to which no third party was privy.

The absence of such scribes is amply rectified with the *Table-Talk*: however, in that much of this material is fragmentary and unreliable, it would be unwise to base any judgment upon its tantalizing *dicta*, many of which are clearly confused. Thus Luther seems to minimize in a defensive manner his debts to the literary researches of humanism, and particularly Erasmus, by emphasizing his obligation to Staupitz.[195] There is also every possibility that this evidence is seriously distorted, either through the inaccuracies of those who jotted down (and subsequently occasionally embellished) Luther's comments, or though the effects of the passage of time on Luther's memory of events, or perception of their significance. The *Table-Talk*, it must be remembered, dates from a quarter of a century after the period when Staupitz exercised pastoral oversight over Luther.

Second, no significant dependence of Luther upon Staupitz may be demonstrated on the basis of a point-by-point comparison of their writings for the period 1512–19. Oberman's suggestion that Staupitz mediated a late medieval Augustinian tradition to Luther; Bauer's suggestion that what was mediated was a hermeneutical program; Bizer's thesis concerning a doctrine of justification – all must be deemed to rest upon quite insufficient evidence.[196] Luther appears to have exhibited a remarkable degree of independence in all these matters from Staupitz, if he was influenced by him at all. It is certainly true that Luther developed certain themes that may have originated from Staupitz – such as the recognition of the pastoral significance of the wounds of Christ, and the insight that penance begins with the love of God – but these were commonplaces in much late medieval thought, and are perhaps more appropriately designated as "spirituality" rather than "theology."[197] In any case, they cannot be seen as specific insights of the *schola Augustiniana moderna*. These themes in themselves cannot be regarded as establishing the intellectual origins of Luther's reforming theology, but merely reinforce the general perception of the continuities and points of contact between Luther and his theological and spiritual milieu.

Finally, the difficult question must be asked whether Staupitz can in any sense be regarded as a representative of the *schola Augustiniana moderna*. Although this assumption is implicit in Oberman's thesis, it cannot be sustained on the basis of the evidence available. In his writings, Staupitz does not refer to any theologians usually held to be associated with this school – such as Gregory of Rimini or Hugolino of Orvieto. Indeed, where he does refer to Augustinian theologians, he seems to demonstrate a distinct preference for the earlier Augustinian tradition, associated with Giles of Rome, suggesting that he is, if anything, a representative of the *schola Aegidiana*, rather than the *schola Augustiniana moderna*.[198]

On the basis of considerations such as those that we have outlined above, Luther's relationship to the "medieval Augustinian tradition" may be summarized as follows. Although there are excellent reasons for suggesting that a distinctive school of thought – which is now generally designated the *schola Augustiniana moderna* – developed within the Augustinian Order in the late medieval period, the evidence suggests that Luther did not encounter such a school in either his Erfurt or Wittenberg periods. Hence there is no literary evidence of a direct connection between Luther and any representative of this school prior to 1519: although it is possible to place Luther and certain late medieval Augustinians in parallel columns at points, the necessary evidence for the *direct textual* influence of the latter upon the former is absent.[199] Furthermore, the suggestion that the *schola Augustiniana moderna* was well established within the Augustinian Order by the sixteenth century does not permit us to conclude that it was represented at every Augustinian priory in Europe, such as that at Erfurt.

Those Augustinian theologians who exercised the most influence over Luther in his formative years – such as Nathin, Arnoldi, and Staupitz – may not have been typical of the currents of thought that some have suggested were prevalent within the late medieval Augustinian Order, but the the fact remains that it was these specific individuals, whether representative or not, who exercised the greatest influence over the development of Luther's theology. The specifics of Luther's local situation cannot be assumed to mirror the generalities of the period. There can be little doubt that Luther was influenced, at least to some extent, by theological currents and methods associated with his Order – but he appears to have encountered these in the form of specific personalities at Erfurt and Wittenberg, who simply were not

typical of this school of thought that some have identified within the Augustinian Order at the time. Finally, certain points at which the influence of the *schola Augustiniana moderna* upon Luther's early theology might be inferred may more plausibly be explained in terms of the direct influence of the *via moderna*.

An excellent example of this difficulty is provided by Luther's critique of the implication of created habits of grace in justification. The concept of a created habit of grace had its origins in the twelfth century,[200] and was understood as an ontologically necessary intermediate in the process of justification. In other words, the theologians of High Scholasticism, working on the basis of an ontological or *ex natura rei* concept of causality, argued that such a habit was a necessary intermediate in justification. As noted earlier, the later medieval period was characterized by a covenantal or *ex pacto divino* concept of causality, which rendered such habits unnecessary in justification. As a result, the theologians of both the *via moderna* and *schola Augustiniana moderna* treated created habits as unnecessary hypotheses in the theology of justification, so that their existence was deemed to be irrelevant, if they existed at all. Within the *schola Augustiniana moderna*, a tendency to shift the emphasis away from the work of created grace to that of uncreated grace (in other words, to the Holy Spirit) is particularly evident, although not sufficiently marked to distinguish this school decisively from the *via moderna*.

Luther's marginal comments on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, dating from 1509–10, demonstrate precisely this critique of the role of created habits in justification.[201] For Luther, the concept of a created habit of grace is both unhelpful and unnecessary: if the concept is to be retained in any form, it should be understood to refer to the bond of love that unites God to humanity – in other words, the uncreated grace of the Holy Spirit: *habitus autem est spiritus sanctus*.[202] Although this radical critique of the role of created habits in justification was once thought to mark a complete break with the theology of the medieval period, it is clear that Luther merely reproduced the common late medieval attitude to such habits, characteristic of both the *via moderna* and *schola Augustiniana moderna* alike. Far from marking a break with the late medieval tradition, Luther demonstrates his continuity with it at this point. It is not clear, however, whether Luther's critique parallels that of the *via moderna* or *schola Augustiniana moderna*: his comments are too compressed and concise to permit this potentially

important distinction to be made at this point. It is on the basis of other considerations that the young Luther is to be identified as an exponent of the soteriology of the *via moderna*.

The *pactum* theology noted above (pp. 78–9) is a leading feature of the soteriology of the *via moderna*, but not of the *schola Augustiniana moderna*.[203] Two leading features of this theology may be noted. First, a minimum precondition is specified for justification. Individuals must "do their best" (*quod in se est*), and once this precondition has been met, God is under a self-imposed obligation to reward those who have done so with the gift of justifying grace: *facienti quod in se est, Deus non denegat gratiam*.[204] Second, the relation between the person who does *quod in se est* and their subsequent justification is not a consequence of the necessary relationship of these two entities, but is solely a consequence of the divine ordination that they should be causally related in this way. To put this another way, the causality of this relationship is conceptualized as arising *ex pacto divino*, rather than *ex natura rei*.

Both these aspects of this *pactum* theology are developed with characteristic brilliance in Luther's *Dictata super Psalterium* of 1513–15.[205] For example, five significant points of contact between Luther's soteriology and that of the *via moderna* may be demonstrated, including both those noted above.[206] Luther endorses the soteriological axiom of the *via moderna* – *facienti quod in se est, Deus non denegat gratiam* – on the basis of its covenantal foundations.[207] The only reason why grace and faith are implicated in justification is on account of the divine covenant (*pactum*) with humanity.[208] Indeed, at times Luther seems to draw directly upon the statements of Gabriel Biel concerning the *pactum* between God and humanity,[209] further reinforcing the general perception of a direct theological dependence of the young Luther upon the Tübingen *modernus*.

A further point of importance here concerns Luther's theological breakthrough, which was centered upon the question of the meaning of the nuanced phrase "the righteousness of God" (*iustitia Dei*).[210] In his celebrated autobiographical statement of 1545, Luther explains how he could not conceive how the concept of the "righteousness of God" could be thought of as gospel, in that it appeared to promise nothing but condemnation for the sinner.[211] Underlying Luther's statements is the concept of *iustitia Dei* associated with the *pactum* theology of the *via moderna*:[212] the "righteousness of God" is to be conceived as that (ultimately unknowable) divine quality that rewards the person who

does *quod in se est* with justification, and punishes the person who does not. Luther's early difficulties with this concept were only resolved in 1515, when he abandoned the soteriological framework of the *via moderna*: his earlier wrestlings with the concept represent nothing more than attempts to clarify it within the existing context of that framework.[213] Luther's reference to the views of the "doctors who taught him" in the autobiographical fragment is clearly a direct reference to the Erfurt *moderni*.

The evidence available concerning the continuity between Luther and the *via moderna* can be summarized as follows.

1 There is unequivocal literary evidence to the effect that Luther was directly dependent upon theologians of the *via moderna*, supremely Gabriel Biel.
2 The soteriological framework within which Luther operated throughout the period 1513–15 is unquestionably that of the *via moderna*. This is particularly clear from his use of the *pactum* theology and the associated concepts of *facere quod in se est* and *ex pacto divino* causality, and the crucial concept of the "righteousness of God."
3 There are points in Luther's later writings where he denounces the soteriological views of the *via moderna*, occasionally adding that he once held such views himself,[214] where the views condemned are those he affirmed and expounded in the *Dictata super Psalterium*.

In addition to these clear lines of evidence, there are more ambiguous considerations, not decisive in themselves, but of no small importance as part of the overall cumulative case we have built up – for example, the fact that his early teachers at Erfurt were *moderni*, the possibility that Luther may to have gone to Wittenberg as a known representative of the *via moderna*, and the fact that his critique of the role of created grace in justification may (but need not) parallel that of the *via moderna*. The overall picture is that of a theologian initially committed to the soteriology of the *via moderna*, who finally broke free from it over an extended period of time. As such, the intellectual origins of Luther's reforming theology may be stated with some confidence to be linked with the theology of the *via moderna*. Luther's reforming breakthrough does not appear to have arisen through external contact with the *schola Augustiniana moderna*, but through internal dissatisfaction with the

theological coherence and biblical warrants for the general soteriological position of the *via moderna*. The breakthrough resulted from a critical appraisal of the *via moderna*, undertaken from within on the basis of its distinctive approach to sources and methods – particularly, as we shall see, on the basis of its biblical hermeneutics.

This conclusion, if correct, is of considerable importance, in that it suggests that Luther's theological breakthrough did not arise through any fundamental *methodological* innovation, which could be ascribed to the influence of humanism. As we shall indicate later, Luther's early biblical hermeneutics are thoroughly medieval, and his theological breakthrough cannot be correlated directly with any prior shift in his hermeneutical presuppositions. There are reasons for suggesting that Luther's theological breakthrough may parallel those of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas before him – both of whom came to develop more theocentric soteriologies for reasons which reflect an increased awareness of the priority of divine grace over human actions, rather than any fundamental shift in theological method.[215] Thus it is significant that Luther occasionally refers to Augustine's account of his own theological breakthrough (contained in the eighth book of the *Confessions*) in the *Dictata super Psalterium*, apparently treating it as a normative paradigm for divine illumination.[216] Although the theological developments associated with Luther's early period are notoriously difficult to analyze, there are good reasons for suggesting that Luther may have read the seminal anti-Pelagian writing of Augustine, *De spiritu de litera*, by late 1515,[217] and that this treatise probably at least catalyzed Luther's soteriological deliberations, and may possibly even have informed them. It is certainly significant that Karlstadt, in turning (1516–17) to consider substantially the same soteriological questions as those that appear to have confronted Luther in the period 1513–15, chose to discuss them with reference to precisely this anti-Pelagian writing.[218] There are thus grounds for suggesting that the origins of the Wittenberg Reformation are linked to a rediscovery of Augustine, and an ensuing criticism *initially* of the soteriology of the *via moderna*, and *subsequently* of aspects of Augustine's theology of grace (particularly his views on the nature of justifying righteousness).[219] Luther appears to have taken several years to work fully through his initial theological insights, with the result that his theology over the period 1513–19 consists essentially of a program of reworking (ultimately to reject) the soteriology of the *via moderna* in the light of his new insights.[220]

The intellectual origins of the Wittenberg Reformation are thus quite distinct from those of the Reformed church, as will become increasingly clear when their hermeneutical methods are considered. The leading members of the Wittenberg theological faculty over the period 1513–18 were university theologians with well-established affinities with the theological schools of the later medieval period.[221] The origins of that Reformation concerned aspects of Augustine's theology of grace, initially in relation to Luther's difficulties concerning the "righteousness of God," and subsequently in relation to Karlstadt's critical study of the Augustinian provenance of late medieval soteriology, culminating in the 151 theses of April 1517. The origins of the Lutheran Reformation thus differ from those of the Reformed church in four critical respects:

1 The Wittenberg circle belonged to a group that was sociologically distinct from – and culturally isolated from – the humanist sodalities to which Zwingli and his circle of Swiss humanists belonged, or to which they looked for a sense of group identity and support.
2 The *vera theologia* shaped at Wittenberg was essentially an academic theology, forged in a university context, which had yet to be applied to the life of the church or wider community. Zwingli's essentially humanist vision of Reformation as a reform of life and morals was forged in direct contact with the church and community of Zurich, and was not initially driven by a specific theological agenda.
3 The Wittenberg theologians were primarily concerned with soteriology, expressed in the doctrine of justification. Luther's personal difficulties in this area may well have led to others, such as Karlstadt, developing this concern. This interest in the doctrine of justification is conspicuously absent from the first phase of the development of Reformed theology:[222] indeed, as was noted in the previous chapter, the first Reformed theologians may have developed an essentially moralist doctrine of justification that was potentially opposed to the theocentric soteriology being forged at Wittenberg.
4 The first period of the Wittenberg Reformation was characterized by a growing realization of the incompatibility of the *vera theologia* and the soteriology of the *via moderna*. As a result, the emerging *vera theologia* was increasingly articulated in conscious opposition to that soteriology, as in Karlstadt's 151 theses of April 1517, or Luther's

Disputatio contra scholasticam theologiam of September of that year. Whereas the early theologians of the Reformed church were equally dismissive of scholastic theology, they felt under no obligation to enter into a sustained debate with its representatives, however great their personal interest in them may have been: as Zwingli's *Commentarius* of 1525 indicates, it was deemed adequate for polemical purposes simply to dismiss the *theologastri* on essentially Erasmian grounds. The direct and sustained public engagement with the theology of the *via moderna* is a leading feature of the early reforming theology of the Wittenberg faculty. The fact that the Wittenberg reforming theology demonstrated both intellectual continuity and discontinuity with that of the later medieval period made it imperative at the time that these discontinuities be identified and defended. There are thus excellent reasons for suggesting that, in regard to their motivation, methods, and substance, the origins of the Lutheran and Reformed theologies were quite distinct – a theme that will be returned to later.

The last two chapters have been concerned with the identification and evaluation of the influence of humanism and late medieval theology upon the intellectual origins of the Reformation. It will be clear that this influence extends to include theological sources and methods. In the following chapters the changing attitudes toward theological sources and methods in the late medieval period will be considered, in order to establish the extent of the continuity between this period and that of the Reformation.

Part 2

Sources and Methods

4

Scripture: Translation, Text, and Tradition

The Reformation is often portrayed as a return to, or rediscovery, of the Bible, remedying centuries of theological neglect of this foundational resource for Christian theology, or a deliberate evasion of an engagement with Scripture. The reality is more complex and infinitely more interesting. As study after study has made clear, the theological schools of the Middle Ages regarded Scripture as being of supreme importance in matters of doctrine. The issues of debate concerned precisely what was to be understood by the text of Scripture, and the manner in which it was to be interpreted.

The humanist emphasis on returning *ad fontes* carried with it the imperative that these sources be read in their original languages. This demand, seemingly theologically innocuous, contained within itself many of the leading themes of the Reformation. The Vulgate translation of Scripture, regarded as an accurate translation and hence as possessing theological authority directly equivalent to that of "Scripture," was demonstrated to be unreliable. The extent of that reliability, and its theological implications, were the subject of considerable debate. The foundations of a further development were laid in the late fifteenth century, when a new concern for ensuring textual accuracy led to the emergence of techniques for evaluating the reliability of received texts – including the Vulgate's textual traditions.[1] A fundamental equation upon which much medieval theology had been founded was now regarded as questionable. No longer could "Scripture" be directly equated with "the traditional Latin text of the Vulgate."[2] A series of critical translation and textual issues had to be confronted.

Yet humanism did more than emphasize the importance of studying Scripture in its original languages; it made available new tools for the interpretation of the biblical text – tools that undermined both the

traditional scholastic hermeneutical tools, and potentially some of the theological doctrines that were derived on their basis. At the very least, the rise of Renaissance humanism thus posed a double challenge to the received tradition of western theology, and by doing so opened the way to theological criticism and experimentation that changed the face of western Christendom. We shall consider these in chapter 5. Our attention now turns to the changing understandings of the designation of the term *scriptura* on the eve of the Reformation.

The Medieval Consensus on the Theological Priority of Scripture

The importance of Holy Scripture as a source of Christian theology was universally recognized in the medieval period. Thomas Aquinas may be regarded as speaking for the medieval tradition as a whole when he emphasized that Christian theology was based upon a revelation that ultimately lay beyond the discoveries of the natural sciences.[3] It is interesting to note that Thomas does not deduce the necessity of revelation from human fallenness, sinfulness, or corruption, but from the fact that this knowledge ultimately transcends the natural capacities of humanity *as a creature*. Had this knowledge not been revealed to humanity through divine intervention, it would have remained beyond human reach. Revelation thus establishes the axiomatic points of departure for theological speculation, in much the same way as self-evident principles (*principia per se nota*) do in the philosophical disciplines.[4] The means by which this revelation is transmitted is Holy Scripture, and Christian theology may thus be defined as "Holy Scripture received in a human intellect."[5]

For Thomas, *sacra doctrina* and *sacra scriptura* are virtually synonymous, in that theology is essentially the clarification, vindication, and transmission of the truth revealed in Scripture, through the responsible and appropriate use of *ratio* on the part of the theologian. While nonbiblical terms and concepts may be used in this process of the interpretation and explanation of Scripture, these terms and concepts must be chosen in such a manner that they fully express the "sense" of Scripture.[6] The principle of confining theological argument to Scripture as the source and norm of revealed truth thus functions as a formal methodological principle: for Thomas, theology is *doctrina quaedam secundum revelationem*

divinam.[7] Despite the evident differences between Thomas and his contemporaries over many matters, they are united in their belief that Christian theology is ultimately nothing more and nothing less than the exposition of Scripture.

On the basis of his understanding of the relationship of *scriptura* and *doctrina*, outlined above, Thomas is able to assert that Scripture is the ground of faith, *fidei fundamentum*.[8] The certitude of faith is based upon the authority of Scripture,[9] and this authority ultimately derives from the fact that it is ultimately God and God alone who is the author of Scripture.[10] The canonical Scriptures transmit the truth that people need to know if they are to be saved.[11] But although Scripture is both normative, and in itself clear and sufficient as a basis of theology, it does not follow from this that the truth revealed within it is in any sense readily accessible. Scripture requires to be properly interpreted if it is to function as the foundation of Christian theology.[12]

It is therefore evident that the medieval debate over the *interpretation* of Scripture, which will be considered in the following chapter, is of central importance to our study of the intellectual origins of the Reformation, in that the *content* of theology will be determined by a prior understanding of the correct text of Scripture, and how that text is to be interpreted In other words, doctrine depends upon textual criticism, philology, and biblical hermeneutics. Disagreement upon any of these matters, or developments relating to any of them over a period of time, is pregnant with a potential doctrinal pluralism. In the present and following chapters, we propose to consider the nature and extent of diversity of opinion on such matters in the later medieval period. The discussion opens with the question of the text of Scripture.

The Vulgate Translation of the Bible

The medieval period based its scriptural exegesis upon the Vulgate translation of the Bible.[13] There was no authorized version of this text, despite the clear need for a standardized text that had been carefully checked against its Hebrew and Greek originals. A number of versions of the text were in circulation, their divergences generally being overlooked. It was not until 1592 that an "official" version of the text was produced by the church authorities, sensitive to the challenges to the authority of the Vulgate by Renaissance humanist scholars and

Protestant theologians.[14] Despite a number of moves in the thirteenth century to revise this translation against the Hebrew and Greek originals,[15] the Vulgate text continued to be the basis of medieval theological speculation. Although more sophisticated defenses of the Vulgate were offered, this reluctance to revise the Vulgate arose simply from the inability of most medieval theologians to deal with the Hebrew language: Andrew of St Victor is perhaps the most important biblical commentator of the twelfth century on account of his use of the Hebrew original of the Old Testament, although he was obliged to seek the assistance of Hebrew scholars from within the local Jewish community in dealing with some of the more puzzling phrases he encountered.[16]

Despite this flirtation with the Old Testament in its original language, there does not appear to have been any sustained attempt throughout the Middle Ages to go behind the Vulgate to the original Hebrew and Greek texts. There was also relatively little attempt to engage with contemporary or classic Jewish exegetical methods, whether applied to the Hebrew text itself, or to the available western translation.[17] Yet the germs of the idea of interacting with the Old Testament in its original language were present, even if these seeds would not flower for several centuries. What would the history of the church have been like if a good working knowledge of the Hebrew language and direct access to the Hebrew text of the Old Testament had been available to the twelfth-century theological renaissance, rather than waiting for the Reformation of the sixteenth century? While it is probably impossible to speculate what history might have looked like if this development had taken place earlier, it is critically important to appreciate that it might have – the basic tools were to hand, even if they were not fully developed or used.

Such was the importance that came to be attached to the Vulgate text that by the middle of the fourteenth century Latin had practically come to have the status of a sacred language, along with Hebrew and Greek. A number of factors appear to have converged to bring about the medieval reluctance to study Scripture in the vernacular. (The use of the term "reluctance" is considered: no universal or absolute prohibition of the translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular was ever issued by a medieval pope or council, nor was any similar prohibition directed against the use of such translations by clergy or laity.) We have already noted Thomas Aquinas's insistence that the interpretation of

Scripture was complex, beyond the competence of the masses. It was believed that the translation of Scripture into the vernacular would open the way to serious misinterpretation of the text.

The medieval hostility toward the reading of the Bible in the vernacular may possibly be traced to a situation that arose in the diocese of Metz, probably in June 1199. The bishop of Metz, in a letter to Innocent III, reported that a large group of lay men and women were gathering regularly in secret to study the Gospels and the letters of Paul in their native language, and requested guidance on how to proceed.[18] It is clear from Innocent's reply to the bishop that he regards the real threat posed by this activity as the usurpation of the office of preaching, a matter in which they should be taken to task (*in eo tamen apparent merito arguendi*). The real objection to the practice lies in its potential implications for the doctrine and order of the church through the usurpation of a clerical role on the part of the laity, rather than any problems that might arise through their deeper knowledge of the text of the Scriptures.

The influence of the Bible upon western European society – such as in the concept of established government, in which the Old Testament concept of kingship appears to have been regarded as paradigmatic – from the ninth to the late eleventh centuries is well established, as is the fact that its *direct* influence diminished considerably from the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries.[19] Nevertheless, the *indirect* influence of the Bible over this later period was considerable, in that this influence was mediated through canon law and scholastic theology.[20] One reason for the diminution of the direct influence of the Bible in matters of theology and canon law appears to have been the tendency to approach the biblical text itself indirectly, through a filter of glosses – the *Glossa Ordinaria*.

Although this gloss had traditionally been regarded as the work of the ninth-century monk Walafrid Strabo,[21] it is now known that the compilation of the work represented an important milestone in the development of later twelfth-century theological method. In effect, the *Glossa Ordinaria* may be regarded as a composite and extended running commentary upon the text of the Bible, characterized by its brevity, clarity, and authoritativeness, drawing upon the chief sources of the patristic period. The *Glossa* seems to have been largely the work of Anselm of Laon, although other major contributors included Berengar of Tours, Manegold of Lautenbach, Lambert of Utrecht, and Gilbert

the Universal.[22] So influential did this commentary become that, by the end of the twelfth century, much biblical commentary and exegesis was reduced to restating the comments of the gloss. It is this feature of the biblical commentaries of Stephen Langton – the mere restating of "extracts from the gloss" – that eventually led to the unraveling of the mystery of the origins of the *Glossa Ordinaria*.[23] The essential point to appreciate here is that the contemporary reader of Scripture tended to approach the text of Scripture indirectly, through the interpretative gloss, encountering directly the accumulated wisdom of previous interpreters rather than the text itself. Errors on the part of enthusiastic copyists occasionally led to glosses being incorporated into the text of Scripture itself, leading to an unintended yet even more significant influence of the glossator upon the reader.

Although the translation of the Bible into the vernacular – such as the Wycliffite versions of the fourteenth century[24] – is often regarded as a turning point in the medieval interpretation of the Bible, there are reasons for questioning this judgment. Although the struggle to make such translations available to a wider audience was a significant element in pre-Reformation religious polemic – as in early fifteenth-century England – their theological significance should not be exaggerated. They were English translations, yet they were translations of the Latin Vulgate text, whose accuracy and reliability would be the subject of much debate in the later Renaissance. Such translations would ultimately depend upon philological techniques such as those that would be developed in the Italian Renaissance.

Without direct access to the original Hebrew and Greek texts of the Old and New Testament, and without the philological techniques necessary to translate them, vernacular versions of Scripture could not hope to achieve any authoritative status, despite their evident use in popularizing antiestablishment views. These techniques would be developed and increasingly refined in the Italian Renaissance of the later fifteenth century, and be put to uses of considerable theological significance in the sixteenth century. Yet, perhaps curiously, those who then developed these techniques appear to have done so for reasons that had little direct hearing upon matters of theology: the humanists seem to have regarded these methods as an essential aspect of their broad educational and cultural program and, with perhaps occasional exceptions, not to have noticed (or perhaps to have chosen to overlook) their potential theological significance when applied to the New

Testament text. It is to a consideration of the humanist movement of the fifteenth century that we must now turn.

The Humanist Return *Ad Fontes*

It is clear that the humanists of the Renaissance, in their quest for written and spoken eloquence, considered in an earlier chapter, turned to the acknowledged masters of antiquity in order to learn from them. The high regard in which Cicero's *Orationes* were held led to intense study of his works – to which Bartolommeo della Fonte's orations bear eloquent witness.[25] This interest in the literature of classical antiquity was not regarded as an end in itself, but as a means to the end of *eloquentia*. Thus Jerome, Augustine, Arnobius, Cyprian, and especially Lactantius, were regarded as models of Christian *eloquentia*,[26] while Scripture itself was nothing less than *eloquentia vera theologiae*.[27] For the humanist, it was therefore imperative to turn (or rather to *return*) to the sources of antiquity, whether they were pagan or Christian, in order to learn from them. The renewed interest in classical philology was particularly associated with the need to engage directly with the classics of antiquity, both Greek and Latin. The slogan *ad fontes* came to embody the cultural and educational program of the Renaissance: the direct return to the writings of the classical period – whether secular or sacred – in order to benefit from their eloquence.

The immediate results of this new interest in *eloquentia vera theologiae* will be obvious. First, there was a new interest in studying both Scripture and the fathers directly, rather than through a "filter" of glosses and commentaries. Second, there was a growing recognition of the need to engage directly with both Scripture and (though to a lesser extent) the Greek-speaking fathers in their original languages, rather than in an often inaccurate Latin translation. The new interest in philology thus came to be linked with a concern for the accurate original text of Scripture, and its subsequent translation. In both these areas, the influence of Florentine humanism was decisive. This point was acknowledged by the more humanist among the Reformers. Thus Philip Melanchthon argued that Florence attracted Greek scholars, exiled after the fall of Constantinople, and by doing so, rescued the Greek language from oblivion. Furthermore, the new interest in the study of the Greek language at Florence led to a more informed use of

the Latin language – which had threatened to degenerate into some form of barbarism – as well as providing a key to the study of the Bible in its original language.[28]

In his *Oratio de studiis linguae graecae* (1549), Melanchthon emphasized that it was impossible to return *ad fontes* without a knowledge of the Greek language. This, according to Melanchthon, is the language most capable of expressing the highest spiritual and philosophical truths, and both the New Testament and the earliest patristic works (Melanchthon's theological source texts) were written in it.[29] In order to engage directly with Scripture, and to hear the living voices of Paul and the apostles, it was essential to master the riches of the Greek language.[30] In this matter, Melanchthon can be seen to speak as much as a representative of the humanist tradition as a Reformer, in that the two schools – if, indeed, they could be distinguished at all at this juncture – converged in their program of returning directly to the original texts of the New Testament in its original language. In fact, however, the Florentine Renaissance of the *Quattrocento* was somewhat slow to realize the importance of the Greek language, perhaps on account of the influence of Lorenzo da Monaci and his circle.[31] Lorenzo Valla (c.1406–57), one of the most significant voices calling for a renewal of interest in the Greek language, argued that a knowledge of Greek was necessary if the Latin language itself was to be properly understood and exploited – an argument that he justified by appeal to classical Latin writers.[32]

The study of Hebrew, although undertaken sporadically in the twelfth century, became a more serious proposition through the researches of Giovanni Pico della Mirandola in the final quarter of the *Quattrocento*, although it does not seem to have been regarded as of equal value as the study of Greek. Pico della Mirandola is reported to have found an unacceptably high number of translation errors in the Vulgate version of the Old Testament, and thus to have demonstrated the need for its revision.

It is at this point that consideration of the impact of printing upon the intellectual origins of the Reformation may most conveniently be introduced. That the introduction of printing was both the catalyst and agent of intellectual and social change is now beyond dispute.[33] The role of the printing presses of Europe in the dissemination of the ideas of the Reformation is too well known to require further discussion at this point: it is merely necessary to draw attention to the role of the

medium in relation to the origins, rather than merely the propagation, of the Reformation.[34] Thus the establishment of presses capable of handling Hebrew characters paved the way for a more general familiarity among humanists with that language, and hence more accurate editions and translations of the Old Testament itself. Initially, these presses were located solely in the Iberian peninsula and Italy.[35] Although the production of Hebrew printed works was under way in Italy by 1475, and had become quite extensive a decade later,[36] the rise of anti-Jewish feeling led to the suspension of production of such works, except in the kingdom of Naples. Here the establishment of a sizeable Jewish community led to the issuing of licences *ad stampandum libros* to *magister Jacob hebreo* and *magister Josep hebreo* on March 18, 1487,[37] leading to considerable expansion and development of the printing techniques necessary for the production of books in (or merely containing) Hebrew. It was merely a matter of time before the necessary technology found its way to northern Europe.

Although the earliest published guide to the Hebrew language aimed primarily at Gentiles appears to have been Konrad Pellikan's *De modo legendi et intelligendi Hebraeum* (1504),[38] the most celebrated and influential such introduction to the language remains Johannes Reuchlin's *De rudimentis Hebraicis* (1506). For Reuchlin, the task of sacred philology was to enable the reader to encounter the Old Testament text in the very words with which God had originally spoken it (*quale os dei locutum est*). Where some humanists argued for mastering Hebrew on cultural grounds, Reuchlin adopted an explicitly theological justification for the acquisition of this knowledge. To know Hebrew was to hear the words of God as originally spoken.

Having mastered the Hebrew language – apparently through studying the medieval Jewish grammarians – during a period spent in late Renaissance Italy, Reuchlin returned to northern Europe to write an introduction to the language that would permit direct access to the original of the Old Testament text.[39] An edition of the seven penitential psalms followed in 1512, allowing the reader without access to manuscripts to master some Hebrew texts of the Old Testament. Among those grateful readers was Martin Luther, who purchased a copy of *De rudimentis* before leaving Erfurt for Wittenberg in 1508. The increasing skill with which Luther applied his knowledge of Hebrew to his biblical exegesis over the period 1513–18 is an adequate testimony to the significance of this development,[40] even if it is possible to argue that

Luther's theological breakthrough was not a direct result of this facility. The impact of Reuchlin's *De rudimentis* at Wittenberg was, however, by no means restricted to Luther. Attention has recently been drawn to the influence of this work upon Karlstadt's *Distinctiones Thomistarum*, published on December 30, 1507, a year after Reuchlin's work made its appearance.[41] The continued interest on the part of Karlstadt in the language went some considerable way towards facilitating its introduction into the theological curriculum at Wittenberg in 1518.[42]

This program of direct engagement with the Bible in its original languages was to have considerable theological significance. The theologians of the Latin west were largely dependent upon the Vulgate for their theological deliberations, and the accuracy of both the text and the translation would be called increasingly into question in the later *Quattrocento*, with important theological implications. The textual and philological researches of Lorenzo Valla may be noted here. Valla's textual skill was more than adequately demonstrated through his exposure of the spurious character of the so-called "Donation of Constantine."[43] His work on the Greek text of the New Testament convinced him of the serious inaccuracy of the Vulgate translation, and hence of the theology of those who relied upon it.[44] The editing and publication of this work by Erasmus in 1505 as *Adnotationes in Novum Testamentum* brought these researches to the attention of a wider public, and served as a basis for Erasmus's own Latin translation of the New Testament a decade later.[45] Valla frequently castigates theologians who base their conclusions upon a Latin translation of the Greek text of the New Testament: "*Has ineptias effutiunt qui, graecae linguae ignari, exponunt e graeco traducta.*"[46] Thus he criticizes Thomas Aquinas's doctrine of cooperative grace as relying upon faulty Latin translations of Pauline texts – for example, 1 Corinthians 15.10. The Vulgate here translated the Greek as *non autem ego, sed gratia Dei mecum*, where Valla declared that the text should read *non autem ego, sed gratia Dei quae est mecum*. Valla comments thus upon the Vulgate version: "*Nihil dicant qui hanc vocant gratiam Dei* cooperanter: *Paulus enim sibi hoc non tribuit, sed totum a Deo refert acceptum*." This program of reverting to the direct study of the original Greek text of the New Testament necessitated the production of editions of the Greek New Testament, leading to the production of the Complutensian Polyglot edition of the Greek New Testament (1514),[47] and Erasmus's *Novum Instrumentum omne* (1516).[48]

By the end of the second decade of the sixteenth century, therefore, the exegesis of the New Testament, whether in monastery or university, could not be realistically undertaken without an appeal to the Greek text of the New Testament. (Although there was also increasing recognition of the need to study the Old Testament in the original Hebrew, the humanist preference for Greek as the language of *eloquentia* inevitably led to the concentration of their attention upon the New Testament documents.) As a consequence of this new interest in the New Testament the accuracy – and thence eventually the *authority* – of the Vulgate was increasingly called into question.

The rise of the view that it was Scripture, and Scripture alone, that could function as the foundation and criterion of such an authentic theology (*vera theologia*),[49] gave added weight to the importance of the new exegetical methods for Christian theology. The great humanist vision of *Christianismus renascens*, shared by so many of the early Reformers, was linked with the recreation of the world of early Christianity through a direct appeal to its sources. As Zwingli remarked, "today the rejected Christ rises again everywhere"[50] – and instrumental in this resurrection was the direct engagement of the church with the title deeds of Christendom. The essential unity of the formal and material principles of the Reformation lies in the fact that to affirm that Christianity was, formally and materially, *solus Christus* was perceived by the Reformers ultimately to depend upon the concurrent affirmation that Christ and his benefits could be known *sola scriptura*.

The new emphasis on the part of the Reformers upon the importance of "sacred philology" as a prerequisite for biblical hermeneutics – and hence theology – was not without its ironies. It is perhaps one of the more intriguing paradoxes of the Reformation that a movement that was initially dedicated to making the "word of God" available to *Herr Omnes* (to use Luther's phrase for "everyone") should actually have *inhibited* this very possibility through an insistence upon the necessity of approaching the biblical text in its original languages. Thus Zwingli, in his debate against the Anabaptist radicals, insisted that the Bible had to be read in its original language if it was to be properly understood, and that such understanding could not come about through a direct appeal to the Holy Spirit.[51] The unlettered would have to rely upon a classical education, rather than a divine linguistic empowerment. Similar views were expressed by Luther in the 1524 tract *An die Ratsherren*, in which he argued that Christian schools should be

established, in which the classical languages, particularly Greek and Hebrew, would be taught. For Luther, the medium through which the Holy Spirit operated was *die Sprachen*.[52] An ignorance of Greek and Hebrew was thus effectively an obstacle to the gospel itself.[53] Although Luther initially appears to have favored the view that all individuals could and should read the Bible in the vernacular, and base their theology directly upon that reading, he subsequently became somewhat skeptical concerning the ability of *Herr Omnes* to interpret Scripture, not least as a result of the Peasants' Revolt of 1525, which seemed to him to rest upon a most distressing misreading and misapplication of Scripture, fostered and encouraged by Anabaptist radicals with a clear political agenda.

A study of the school curricula in Lutheran towns makes the importance of this point clear. The *Schulordnungen* of the Duchy of Württemberg (1559) make provision for the New Testament to be studied only by the most able students in their final years – and even then, the New Testament is to be studied directly only in the original Greek, or Latin translation.[54] Less able students are required to study Luther's *Smaller Catechism* of 1529 instead, which provides such readers with a theologically reliable and sanitized prism through which the New Testament may be read and understood correctly – that is, in a Lutheran manner. As a result, direct engagement with the scriptural text is reserved for scholars; others must approach Scripture through the "filter" of the catechism, which provided a framework within which Scripture could be interpreted. There is thus a curious twist to the Reformation *sola scriptura* principle, in that the interpretation of Scripture was effectively restricted to a limited group of people, rather than the body of faithful believers as a whole. The direct engagement with the original text was reserved for those with the necessary linguistic abilities – and in this respect, the Reformation followed both Erasmus and medieval scholasticism in declining to allow the masses to interpret Scripture for themselves.

The Critique of the Vulgate

The new interest in the Greek text of the New Testament, evident in the later *Quattrocento*, leading to increasing unease concerning the accuracy of the Vulgate translation, had potential theological significance

only within the Latin-speaking (i.e., the western) church. The Greek-speaking (i.e., the eastern) church had always relied directly upon the Greek text of the New Testament, rather than upon an intervening translation. In that the early western church tended to depend upon the eastern for its theology (such as its Christology and Trinitarianism), but developed essentially independently in the aftermath of the theological renaissance of the twelfth century,[55] it is to be expected that the most serious difficulties would arise in relation to doctrines that developed specifically within the Latin-speaking church during the period 1150–1450. It is this period that coincides with the period of theological decline or doctrinal corruption identified by the Reformers, such as Melanchthon. It will therefore be clear that the new concern with, and appreciation of the theological importance of, the Greek text of the New Testament was of potential significance in relation to areas of doctrine in which development took place within the western church during the scholastic period – areas such as Mariology and the theology of the sacraments.

This can be illustrated from some significant translation alterations demanded by Valla and Erasmus. In their translations of the original Greek of Luke 1.28 (*ave gratia plena Dominus tecum*), both Valla and Erasmus pointed out that the Latin phrase *gratia plena* was an inaccurate translation of the Greek participle, which actually meant "accepted into grace," or "favored."[56] Thus Erasmus comments somewhat caustically on the tendency of "certain theologians, such as Bernard, who philosophize marvellously about these words *gratia plena*," diverting their readers from the true meaning of the Gospel text. The Greek participle should be translated as *gratificata*, or perhaps as *gratiosa*.[57] There had been a tendency, perhaps more marked in popular than in academic Mariology, to treat the phrase as implying that Mary was essentially a vessel of grace: this interpretation was now excluded, or at least robbed of its initial plausibility, through the new philology.

Perhaps more significant, however, was the severing of the hitherto presumed semantic link between the mental attitude of repentance and the sacrament of penance, which had been widely assumed, not least on account of the Vulgate translation of Matthew 4.17: "*Exinde coepit Jesus praedicare et dicere paenitentiam agite adpropinquavit enim regnum caelorum*." This had been taken to imply the need to "do penance" in preparation for the coming of the Kingdom of God.[58] (The ambiguity of the Latin ward *poenitentia*, which could be translated as the mental

state of "repentance," or the sacrament of "penance," should be noted.) This link was initially weakened, and subsequently eliminated, through the rise of the new philology. Thus Erasmus initially translated the Greek verb as *poeniteat vos* ("be penitent"), and subsequently as *resipiscite* ("come to your senses"). Both translations represented a decoupling of the inner mental transformation of repentance from the institutional ordinance of penance, and pointed to the need for at least some degree of theological revision of existing beliefs.

Perhaps the most debated point to arise from the new approach to the Vulgate text was the proper translation of Hebrews 2.7, the subject of a heated controversy between Lefèvre d'Etaples and Erasmus in the years 1515–17.[59] Lefèvre had noted the discrepancy between the Septuagint and the Hebrew versions of Psalm 8.6 in his *Quincuplex Psalterium* of 1509, and that the Letter to the Hebrews, in citing this verse, used the Septuagint translation, rather than the Hebrew original according to the Massoretic text. Hebrews 2.7 thus declared that Christ was "made a little lower than *the angels*," whereas Lefèvre argued that the text should be corrected to read "made a little lower *than God*" (*minuisti eum paulominus a Deo*). In his *Annotationes* of 1516, Erasmus responded unsympathetically to this suggestion, arguing that the original text of Hebrews must be allowed to remain unaltered, despite the fact that it contained what seemed, at least on the face of it, to be an error.[60] In the second edition of his *Epistolae Pauli* of the same year, Lefèvre took issue with Erasmus's response to the difficulty.[61] Such was the interest the debate aroused that contemporary exegetes were obliged to make reference to the controversy, as may be seen from the comments of Wendelin Steinbach and Martin Luther, both writing toward the end of the second decade of the century, For Steinbach – a convinced adherent of the *via moderna*, and hence inclined to emphasize the importance of the *determinationes ecclesiae* – the continued use of the Vulgate was justified on account of the authority of the church, and the long-standing use of the Vulgate text in theological debates: "*sufficit nobis auctoritatis ecclesiae et usus multorum temporum in ecclesia Dei legencium, ut nostra habet translacio.*"[62] Luther, discussing the question at some length,[63] demonstrates that the intricacies of the technical philological debate (not to mention the details of the personal rancor that developed between Lefèvre d'Etaples and Erasmus) were fully appreciated at Wittenberg.[64]

The importance of this debate lies in its relevance to the new understanding of the nature of exegesis in the early sixteenth century. Whereas

earlier generations of exegetes had tended to confine themselves to the repetition of the views of the *Glossa Ordinaria* or other established authorities, the humanist exegetes concerned themselves directly with the original biblical texts in their original languages. The growing awareness of the inaccuracy and inadequacy of the Vulgate inevitably raised questions in the minds of exegetes concerning its theological reliability and authority. Unless theology and exegesis were to become divorced, as disciplines of no relevance to each other, it was clear that some accommodation to the new humanist exegetical methods was necessary. But it must not be thought that theologians alone were confronted with a dilemma through the philological and textual work of the humanists. Precisely the same difficulties were being raised through the work of French humanist jurists.

The early sixteenth century saw a major controversy develop within legal circles concerning the nature of law. The older Italian school (*mos italicus*) was based upon the glosses and commentaries of the medieval jurists, whereas the rival French school, developing at Bourges in the early sixteenth century (*mos gallicus*) appealed directly to the original legal sources of antiquity.[65] This may be illustrated from Guillaume Budé's *Annotationes in quattuor et vigintii Pandectarum libros* (1508), in which this leading French humanist jurist bypassed the glosses of Accursius and Bartholus on the Justinian *Pandects* in order to engage directly with the original texts themselves. Critical source studies were thus substituted for glossing or commenting.[66] The theological significance of this technique was not overlooked by Budé: in 1526, he re-edited his *Annotationes*, and applied the same techniques to the Vulgate text. In many respects, the *mos gallicus* parallels the new humanist approach to Scripture, in which the original text is addressed directly, and interpreted on the basis of scientific philological and historical methods, whereas the *mos italicus* parallels the older scholastic approach to Scripture, in which the original text is approached through a "filter" of glosses (such as the *Glossa Ordinaria*) or commentaries, which are invested with the accumulated authority of tradition.

The tension between the *mos gallicus* and *mos italicus* in fourteenth-century jurisprudence also points to another factor relevant to the present study. Although the new philological and exegetical techniques that were destined to exercise so powerful an influence over early sixteenth-century humanism were developed in Italy, they were not applied there, neither in matters of theology nor jurisprudence. Valla's

Collatio of 1444, it may be recalled, was not published until 1505, when Erasmus discovered a manuscript of the work in the library of the Praetermonstratensians near Louvain.[67] The rapid development of "sacred philology" – in relation to which the publication (by Erasmus) of Valla's *Adnotationes* (1505), Reuchlin's *De rudimentis Hebraicis* (1506) and *Psalterium Quincuplex* (1512), and Erasmus's *Novum Instrumentum omne* (1516), are milestones – although originally based upon Italian ideas and methods, received its fullest development in northern Europe. The ideas of the Renaissance appear to have made their way north of the Alps through the interchange of persons, the exchange of letters, and through manuscripts and printed works,[68] and to have exercised a greater influence upon jurisprudence and theology in England, France, the Lowlands, and Germany than in their native Italy. The influence of John Colet at Oxford,[69] Lefèvre d'Etaples at Paris,[70] Johannes Reuchlin at Württemberg,[71] and the *philosophia Christi* of Erasmus throughout much of Europe,[72] bears testimony to the vitality and creativity of humanism in Northern Europe, and is indicative of the potential influence of the new historical and philological techniques upon biblical exegesis – and hence theological speculation.

The rapid developments in "sacred philology" in northern Europe in the first and second decades of the sixteenth century thus called into question the scriptural basis of a number of doctrines, even if it did not necessarily totally undermine them. For the humanists, whatever authority Scripture might possess derived from the original texts in their original languages, rather than from the Vulgate, which was increasingly recognized as unreliable and inaccurate. In that the catholic church continued to insist that the Vulgate was a doctrinally normative translation, a tension inevitably developed between humanist biblical scholarship and catholic theology. It is therefore significant that the first generation of Reformers, in both Germany and Switzerland, were people who had generally been deeply influenced by the "new philology." Luther in particular regarded the rise of "sacred philology" (*die Sprachen*) as nothing less than providentially ordained, in that the divine wisdom and providence had provided the means by which a much-needed purification and reform of doctrine might come about.[73] Through immediate access to the original text in the original language, the theologian could wrestle directly with the "Word of God,"[74] unhindered by "filters" of glosses and commentaries that placed the views of previous interpreters between the exegete and the text. For the

Reformers, "sacred philology" provided the key by means of which the theologian could break free from the confines of medieval exegesis, and return *ad fontes* to the title deeds of the Christian faith rather than their medieval expressions, to forge once more the authentic theology of the early church.

Yet Erasmus's criticism of the Vulgate text extended far beyond his insistence that it represented an inaccurate translation of the original biblical languages. For Erasmus, it was important to consult original Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, in order to ensure that the Greek text that the Vulgate purported to translate was indeed accurately established.[75] Unfortunately, Erasmus encountered difficulties at this point. Many of the best manuscripts of the New Testament books had been loaned by the Vatican to the group of scholars working at Alcalá de Henares to produce what became known as the Complutensian Polyglot – a work that was set in type by 1517, but was not printed until March 1522, due to delays in procuring the necessary papal licence. Erasmus was obliged, in consequences, to make the best use of whatever texts he could lay his hands on. As far as can be seen, Erasmus used six cursive Greek manuscripts for his editorial work, most dating from the eleventh or twelfth centuries and most of which represent the Byzantine Imperial text, now widely recognized to be the poorest of the New Testament textual traditions – thus bequeathing his successors the mammoth task of correcting this *textus receptus* against the superior Alexandrian and western traditions.[76] Yet Eramus's editorial work was so poor that the *textus receptus* was not even a reliable witness to the Byzantine text, includings readings found in no known witness to that text. The most recent study of Erasmus's editorial work suggests that there are 1,838 points of difference between Erasmus's text and the most reliable version of the Byzantine text.[77] In addition to these discrepancies, Erasmus's printed text included several thousand typographical errors, the source of considerable irritation to his admirers and amusement to his critics.

Although we have a good understanding of the critical principles that would have guided Erasmus's editing of these texts,[78] he does not appear to have been able to implement these fully due to lack of an adequate number of reliable sources. Erasmus's earlier editing of the Senecan *Lucubrationes* had proceeded on the basis of a mere two manuscripts;[79] the textual variances, however, were less than those he had to face in the case of the New Testament. The resulting text was,

in Erasmus's own words, *praecipitatum verius quam editum* – "thrown together, rather than edited" – and shows the marks of hasty editing at point after point.

Examples of Erasmus's questionable editing are not difficult to discern. He was obliged to borrow a single text of the Revelation of St John from his colleague Reuchlin;[80] this text lacked its final page, containing the last six verses of this biblical work (Revelation 22:16–21). Undeterred, Erasmus simply translated the Vulgate version of these verses into Greek, introducing some errors in doing so. This "factitious" approach to the editorial process was replicated elsewhere. For example, Erasmus added what is now Acts 8:37 to his Greek text, despite the virtual absence of any textual support in the Greek manuscript tradition, apparently regarding the occurrence of the verse in the Vulgate as adequate grounds for its inclusion. Similarly, Acts 9:6 was interpolated from the Vulgate, despite its absence from the Greek originals. Yet Erasmus chose to omit the "Johannine Comma" (1 John 5:7–8, using the traditional numbering system) because there was no support for the text in the Greek manuscripts at his disposal.[81] The doxology of Paul's letter to the Romans, which the Byzantine text places at the end of the fourteenth chapter, was relocated to the end of the sixteenth, following the Vulgate.

Despite these many flaws, Erasmus's criticism of the Vulgate sent shock waves throughout the more conservative sections of the European church. His insistence that historical and philological considerations take priority over their theological counterparts was widely seen as a challenge to the received orthodoxy of the medieval church. Martin Dorp argued that Erasmus was incorrect to rely upon purely philological considerations in his textual and exegetical work; the theologian must take precedence over the grammarian.[82] Jacobus Lopez de Stunica, an editor of the forthcoming Complutensian Polyglot, criticized Erasmus's text for various faults, and for the omission of the clause in 1 John 5:7–8. His *Annotationes contra Erasmum Roterodamum* (1520) raised questions over Erasmus's philological competence, while simultaneously expressing nervousness concerning the theological implications of his proposed translation changes.[83] Edward Lee, later to become Archbishop of York, concentrated his critical energies on demonstrating the unacceptable theological results of the Erasmian enterprise.[84]

Yet the damage was done. With the growing recognition that certain hitherto uncontested theological beliefs rested on translation errors,

an agenda for reform had been set. The demand that Scripture be read in its original languages had opened a Pandora's box. What else might follow from this new understanding of what the term *scriptura* entailed? Scripture was widely regarded as the sole materially sufficient theological source in the later medieval period – a factor that goes some considerable way toward explaining the crisis occasioned within early sixteenth-century theology as humanist textual and philological investigations increasingly challenged the prevailing view that "Scripture" could be identified with "the Vulgate text."

Thus far, we have concentrated on issues concerning the text of Scripture, and how it is to be translated. Yet the religious controversies of the sixteenth century also witnessed a renewed interest in the importance of tradition in relation to the explication and application of Scripture. In the light of the importance of this issue for a number of Reformation issues, including the way in which the *sola scriptura* principle is to be understood, and especially the role of the church fathers in theological reflection, we may now turn to deal with the medieval debates over the theological significance of tradition.

The Concept of Tradition

One of the most enduring stereotypes of the relation between the Reformation and the late medieval period is that the latter is characterized by an appeal to *both* Scripture *and* tradition as theological sources, whereas the former appealed to Scripture alone (*sola scriptura*). The Council of Trent, in its decree on Scripture and tradition, has generally been regarded as endorsing the medieval view in recognizing these two distinct theological sources. The Reformation, therefore, may be regarded as marking a break with the medieval period in this important respect, so that Wycliffe and Huss may therefore be regarded as "Forerunners of the Reformation."[85] Influential though this stereotype has been on shaping both scholarly and popular perceptions of both the late medieval era and the Reformation in the early twentieth century, it is becoming increasingly clear that it simply cannot stand up to critical examination. The medieval period in general was characterized by its general conviction that Scripture was the sole material base of Christian theology, thus forcing us to reconsider what, if anything, was distinctive concerning the Reformation principle of *sola scriptura*.[86]

Recent studies have indicated a general medieval consensus on the material sufficiency of Scripture – in other words, that Scripture contained all truths that are necessary for salvation.[87] Thus Duns Scotus affirms that "theology does not concern anything except what is contained in Scripture, and what may be drawn [*elici*] from this," the latter being "contained there *virtualiter*."[88] Indeed, it is evident from even the most superficial reading of late medieval sources that Scripture, and Scripture *alone*, was regarded as the materially sufficient source and norm of Christian theology.[89] No other theological source could be regarded as having this status. Is not this what is expressed by the Reformation principle of *sola scriptura*? The situation is, in fact, considerably more complex, both in relation to the later medieval period and the Reformation itself, and the question demands discussion in more detail.

An important attempt to clarify the question of the relation between Scripture and tradition in late medieval theological method was made by Heiko A. Oberman,[90] with potentially significant consequences for our understanding of the intellectual origins of the Reformation. Oberman draws attention to two main understandings of this relation in the period, while noting the difficulties attending this division.

The first view, which Oberman designates "Tradition I," treats Scripture and tradition as coinherent or coterminous. The second view, which Oberman terms "Tradition II," recognizes an extrascriptural oral tradition as a theological source, in addition to, and not necessarily coinherent or coterminous with, Scripture itself. It is in connection with this second view of the relation of Scripture and tradition that several influential studies have located the seeds of the disintegration of the medieval synthesis.[91] To clarify the situation, we shall consider the "single source" and "two sources" theories (i.e., those that Oberman designates as "Tradition I" and "Tradition II" respectively) as they developed in the medieval period.

The anti-Gnostic polemic of the early church led to the development of a *regula fidei*, by which Scripture as received by the church was regarded as embodying the Christian *kerygma* in a materially sufficient manner.[92] Although the idea is particularly associated with Irenaeus of Lyons,[93] it rapidly became a central theme of the early church's defense of orthodoxy against threats from within and without the Christian community. All truths that were in any sense necessary to salvation were those given publicly and directly in Scripture, or that could be directly inferred from that same Scripture. Christian theology was thus

essentially the exegesis of Scripture within the context of the church.[94] This view, although having its origins in the patristic era, was widely accepted in the Middle Ages. Thus Gerald of Bologna, writing in the early fourteenth century, drew attention to the organic relation of Scripture and church, indicating their mutual dependency.[95] Oberman, however, argues that this early medieval consensus gradually disintegrated through the adoption of the "two source" theory of the canonists. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, when theologians appear to have adopted a "single source" theory, the canonists (such as Ivo of Chartres and Gratian of Bologna) began to develop a "two source" theory, based upon both Scripture and tradition.[96] According to Oberman, when the influence of the canonists was at its greatest in the fourteenth century, "the canon-law tradition started to feed into the theological tradition."[97] In other words, at a time when the theories of the canon lawyer were held in high esteem, theologians began to adopt their methods.

Oberman points to the patristic writer Basil of Caesarea as the ultimate source of this development. Basil traced certain liturgical and theological developments – such as the affirmation of the full divinity of the Holy Spirit – back to an unwritten tradition, and argued that ecclesiastical traditions, whether written or oral, were to be treated with respect by the faithful.[98] In taking up this text and its associated concept of oral tradition, the canonists were, according to Oberman, recognizing two sources of divine revelation, and thus foreshadowing later medieval theology in this respect.

It would seem, however, that Oberman has seriously misunderstood the nature and function of canon law in making this assertion. It is certainly true that Gratian frequently refers to canon law as *divina lex* – but this does not mean that he regarded it as having the status of divine revelation. For Gratian, canon law drew upon two sources: Scripture and *mores*, this latter meaning "customary practice" or "human law": "*Humanum genus duobus regitur, naturali videlicet iure et moribus. Ius naturale est quod in lege et evangelio continetur.*"[99] In other words, canon law is concerned with the natural law (that is, immutable, divinely revealed law) and with human law. This latter – and this latter alone – was subject to revision and amendment by the pope, who had no authority to deny or modify divinely revealed truth. The canonists therefore attempted to distinguish what was divine (and hence permanent) from what was human (and hence transitory) in the field of canon law.

It will be apparent that a clear distinction between *theology* and *law*, between doctrine and discipline, is presupposed by this approach. Thus in distinction 19 of the *Decretum*, Gratian insists upon the *doctrinal* authority of Scripture, while in the following distinction, he goes on to affirm the *judicial* authority of the pope – without being guilty of any inconsistency in this matter. Two different spheres of authority – doctrinal and judicial – are envisaged, which may overlap at points – for example, in the question of identifying heresy, when theological criteria are deployed to identify that a given movement is indeed a heresy, prior to invoking the judicial process to deal with the heresies thus uncovered. At this point, the pope's authority as the interpreter of Scripture was conceded. Brian Tierney has drawn our attention to a text that insists upon the priority of Scripture in matters of doctrine (*primum locum et principale obtineat lex naturalis, vetus testamentum et novum*), while conceding that at points at which the biblical text is obscure or problematic, the authority of the pope as the ultimate interpreter of Scripture must be acknowledged (*in obscuris scripturis et maxime circa articulos fidei maioris auctoritatis esset interpretatio papae*).[100] This authority, however, relates to the pope as the *interpreter* of Scripture, and not as the *source* of an extrascriptural tradition. Oberman seems to miss this point, as is evident from his interpretion of Ambrosius of Speier's remarks, restating precisely the position we have just noted, as "a very sharp and most succinct formulation of Tradition II"[101] (in other words, the "two source" theory), whereas it is evident that Ambrosius is merely restating the common view of the pope's role as arbiter in disputed matters of doctrine.

A further point of relevance to this matter concerns the weighting to be given to various sources of ecclesiastical authority, a point frequently discussed by the canonists.[102] At no stage are papal decretals treated as having anything even approaching the status of Scripture. Theological authority is understood to be primarily invested in Scripture itself, and only in a derivative and restricted manner in the decisions of the pope.[103]

There are, however, passages in the fourteenth-century decretalist writings suggesting that the pope was at liberty to "dispense from Scripture" – that is, to go against the obvious sense of Scripture at points where the context seemed to require it.[104] This suggestion has been treated by some scholars as implying that the pope was regarded as embodying a second source of divine revelation, in addition to

Scripture. A closer examination of the decretalist sources, however, indicates that the pope was regarded as having such liberty only in the limited sphere of ecclesiastical discipline, not in the more complex sphere of doctrine.

The question at stake thus did not concern the eternal truths of doctrine (in which the pope, like everyone else, was regarded as absolutely bound by scriptural revelation), but concerned the lesser (though clearly important and practical) question of whether a given scriptural text was intended to establish an absolute and permanently binding law, valid for all time, or simply to define a provisional code of conduct for the early church (or the Israelites, if the Old Testament is involved), which served as a nothing more than a point of departure for contemporary reflection on the same issue. This question was generally discussed in relation to whether the scriptural prescriptions concerning candidates for ordination might be relaxed (which is not a matter of doctrine). Thus the New Testament lays down that bishops should only be married to one wife, apparently ruling out bigamous individuals from senior church office – an issue that appeared to cause Lucius III some sleepless nights, given the situation of one of his senior clergy.[105] The power to "dispense from Scripture" was not regarded as in any way enabling the pope to act as a second source of divine revelation in matters of doctrine, but simply as conceding that an absolute biblical literalism in matters of church discipline was an impossibility at the time. This naturally raised the question of who might function as the interpreter of Scripture at such points. As with other disputed matters of biblical interpretation, the recognition of the need for a final court of appeal was regarded as an endorsement of, rather than as a challenge to, the primacy of Scripture.

The debate between John XXII and the Franciscans over the question of "the absolute poverty of Christ" served to clarify the relation between pope and Scripture, and to eliminate a possible misunderstanding that had gained some credence in the previous century. John insisted that Scripture was the sole essential foundation upon which articles of faith might be based, and argued that the Franciscans, by their irresponsible appeal to Scripture, called into question both the source of doctrine and the articles of faith based upon it.[106] In making this assertion, John further clarified the position of Alexander III's decretal *Cum Christo* (1170), directed against the Christological nihilism of Peter Lombard (the view *quod Christus secundum quod est homo*

non est aliud). Although Alexander in fact did nothing other than reaffirm the Chalcedonian principle, that Christ was *verus deus et verus homo*, some canonists appear to have interpreted him as introducing a *new* article of faith. Thus Guido de Baysio reports an earlier canonist (identified simply as "Alanus") as drawing the conclusion "*et ita papa potest facere novos articulos fidei*."[107] This interpretation of the signicance of *Cum Christo*, which is clearly incorrect, was emphatically excluded by early fourteenth-century canonists, at the insistence of John XXII. Thus Zenzellinus de Cassanis insisted that the pope had not, and never could have, powers to innovate in matters of doctrine: "*Non credas papam posse facere articulum per quem nova fides inducatur aut veritatis fidei detrahatur aliquid vel accrescat qua ad substantiam*."[108] As Zenzellinus made clear, the only basis of Christian theology was Scripture: "*Fides nisi per scripturam sacram probari penes homines non possit*." There is simply no trace of a "two sources" theory to be found in these ideas: indeed, it may be argued that it was those who were opposed to John XXII (primarily Franciscans, such as William of Ockham) who were obliged to develop a "two source" theory, in that the "single source" theory so evidently failed to give an adequate basis to their views on the poverty of Christ.

Breviscoxa adduces the following argument for the "two source" theory, which indicates the close connection between theology and canon law:

> Catholics are obliged to believe the doctrinal pronouncements of the pope so long as they assert nothing which is contrary to the will of God. We know that catholics are obliged to obey these laws through canon law. Therefore, we know that they are also bound to believe doctrinal pronouncements.[109]

In that we have discussed the points raised by this argument above, its weakness is at once apparent, in that the practice referred to was regarded by the canonists as concerning the *canonical enforcement of papal doctrinal pronouncements made within the context of a "single source" theory of theological sources*. A similar point emerges from Gabriel Biel's discussion of the same thesis. Biel notes that the time and place of the institution of the sacraments of baptism and confirmation are unknown, yet it must be believed that they *were* instituted. An appeal to an unwritten tradition relieves this difficulty.[110]

This discussion calls into question Oberman's analysis of the precise relation between Scripture and tradition in the fourteenth century. Oberman clearly assumes that the "two source" theory derives from the canon law tradition – whereas the decretals and decretalists do not appear to endorse the concept of an extrascriptural *doctrinal* source. Oberman's confusion over this important point appears to arise from a failure to discriminate between the permanent truths of doctrine and the provisional rulings of church discipline. In fairness to Oberman, we may point out that there were many in the fourteenth century who shared more or less the same confusion. Thus John Wycliffe appears to have assumed that papal decretals were regarded by his opponents as having the same authority as Holy Scripture: as any decretal could be revoked at any time, this position seemed to him to be absurd, in that it implied that allegedly permanent theological truths could be altered at will.[111] And absurd it would have been – but this is not what the canonists were suggesting.

Oberman's thesis concerning "Tradition II" (the "two source" theory), however, is not invalidated through the demonstration of the inaccuracy of his opinions concerning its origins. Whatever the origins of the "two source" theory may have been, the late medieval tradition unquestionably included representatives of a school that insisted that "there are many truths which are necessary for salvation which are neither contained in Scripture, nor which are necessary consequences of its contents."[112] But what, it may reasonably be asked, are these truths? In his analysis of this question, Breviscoxa gives seven main lines of argumentation for this "more probable" view of the relation between Scripture and tradition. He includes three examples of truths that are neither included in Scripture, nor can be necessarily deduced from it: "The Apostles' Creed was drawn up by the apostles"; "The See of Peter was translated from Antioch to Rome"; "The Roman popes succeed Peter."[113] If these are illustrative of the truths that may be derived from this theological source, it will be evident that they contain little of significance for our more specifically theological purposes.

But is this really tantamount to a "two source" theory? If the truths of Christian theology were to be arranged hierarchically, such "truths" (which often appear to be nothing more than "truisms") would not be expected to feature prominently. To use Biel's categories, they would appear to belong to *fides implicita*, rather than *fides explicita*. This point appears to be recognized by the proponents of this theory (such as

Breviscoxa), who graded the truths of Christian theology hierarchically, with those truths found in Scripture, or deducible from it, constituting the first rank. Thus, as de Vooght points out, the idea of "unwritten tradition" tended to be employed in subsidiary areas of Christian theology – for example, in relation to the practice of extreme unction, the consecration of the chalice, and the validity of indulgences.[114] This "source" was not used, for instance, to establish the Mariological doctrines that represent one of the areas of genuine theological innovation or development within the medieval period. As Schüssler notes, a critical analysis of the discussion of the concept of an "extrabiblical tradition" in the later Middle Ages indicates that the concept actually had considerably less theological weight than might have been expected,[115] and that it was invoked primarily in relation to matters of liturgical custom and church discipline, rather than doctrine.

The Principle *Sola Scriptura*

"*Ipsa* [*theologia*] *est solum de his quae in sacra scriptura revelantur et de his quae possunt elici ex ipsis illatione necessaria et evidenti.*"[116] For many theologians of the later medieval period, the material sufficiency of Scripture as a theological source was tantamount to the assertion that theology was essentially nothing other than the exposition of Scripture within the sphere of the church.[117] This is not to say that the later medieval period was characterized by homogeneity or general consensus concerning this point. Three broad schools of thought on the matter may be discerned within the later medieval period.[118]

1 The later Franciscan school and *via moderna* tended to develop an ecclesiastical positivism, which laid considerable emphasis upon the *determinationes ecclesiae*. In this, they may be regarded as developing Bonaventure's principle concerning the *consensus ecclesiae*, enunciated in connection with the verbal formula employed in baptism.[119]
2 The Thomists laid considerable emphasis upon the coinherence, if not identity, of Scripture and theology, with due recognition being given to the role of the pope as an arbiter in disputed or obscure matters of theology.
3 Perhaps most interesting is the tendency of the medieval Augustinian tradition, initially with Giles of Rome and subsequently with

> Gregory of Rimini and the *schola Augustiniana moderna*, to emphasize that the basis of Christian theology was *scriptura sola*, with a corresponding tendency to minimize other elements in theology, such as the *determinationes ecclesiae* or metaphysical concepts.[120]

Neither the slogan *sola scriptura*, nor the polemical distance this slogan proposes with reference to unwritten traditions or other putative sources of doctrine, is therefore to be regarded as an innovation introduced by the Reformation, nor as an adequate distinguishing criterion of the movement in relation to late medieval catholicism. At this point, as at so many others, the Reformation must be regarded as a continuation of existing dialogs and debates within the ample girth of late medieval theology. In particular, it points to a particular affinity between the Wittenberg Reformation and the *schola Augustiniana moderna*. This observation naturally raises once more the all-important question of the relation of the Reformers to the *schola Augustiniana moderna*, discussed at some length in chapter 3, and thus assumes an additional significance: can the scriptural positivism of the early Reformation be ascribed to the influence of this, or a comparable, element of late medieval thought?

There are certainly reasons for supposing that one element of the scriptural positivism of the *schola Augustiniana moderna* – the radical critique of the role of Aristotle in theological speculation – was known to the young Luther.[121] In his marginal comments on the *Sentences* (1509–10), Luther appears to parallel Hugolino of Orvieto's critique of Aristotle.[122] What is particularly significant is the observation that although Luther criticized Aristotle frequently from 1509 onwards, his reasons for doing so underwent a radical alteration in the period 1516–17.[123] Although Luther initially criticized Aristotle for reasons similar to those given by Hugolino, his subsequent criticisms – particularly after 1516 – were made on the basis of his new soteriological insights, arising from his discovery of the "righteousness of God." While Luther's early critique of Aristotle appears to rest on revelational considerations, these give way to more penetrating criticisms grounded on soteriological foundations. On the basis of the marginal comments on the *Sentences*, Luther's overall attitude toward Scripture is difficult to correlate with the specific schools typical of the later medieval period. In the *Dictata super Psalterum*, however, these attitudes are clarified, and allow us to relate Luther to his late medieval context with greater accuracy.

Luther's early views on scriptural exegesis are basically those that Oberman designates as "Tradition I" (the "single source" theory). Luther upholds the material sufficiency of Holy Scripture, as understood by the fathers and doctors of the church; in the case of disagreement between these interpreters, the final authority must be regarded as resting within Scripture itself.[124] Nevertheless, it is the *regula fidei* of the church that determines the limits within which the interpretation of Scripture may proceed:[125] "*Extra enim ecclesiam non est cognitio vera Dei*."[126] The mutual coinherence of Scripture and tradition is here clearly affirmed, in terms indicating that Luther stands in the "Tradition I" line associated with Bradwardine, Wycliffe,[127] Huss, Wessel Gansfort, and theologians of the *schola Augustiniana moderna*. Luther appears to demonstrate continuity in this important respect with a well-established line of interpretation of the nature and identity of the sources of theology associated with the later medieval period.

If the sixteenth century saw the continuation of the fourteenth and fifteenth-century debate over the relation between Scripture and tradition, it becomes increasingly important to identify what, if any, novel elements were introduced into the discussion by the Reformers. One obvious difference concerns the extent to which the "Scripture principle" was applied. It is certainly true that the *sola scriptura* principle was employed more radically by the early Reformed theologians than had ever been previously envisaged. The importance of the "Scripture principle" in the Swiss Reformation, following the Zurich disputation of January 29, 1523, has already been noted (see pp. 44–5). The "Zurich disputation decision" – the mandate to preach on the basis of Scripture alone, which rapidly became the basis of similar decisions elsewhere in Switzerland and southern Germany[128] – represents an important milestone in the political development of the Reformation, but it does not primarily concern the intellectual origins of the Reformation.

Nevertheless, it is significant that the origins of the early Reformed church may be explained, at least in part, through the intensification of one significant element of late medieval theology (Tradition I), whereas the Tridentine decree on Scripture and tradition may equally be regarded as the intensification of a quite different element (Tradition II) which now seemed particularly apposite as a polemical device capable of countering the theological views of the Reformers.[129] For the early Reformed theologians, Scripture was now the touchstone of matters of church order and morality, as well as of theology (and in this, as is

indicated below, there may well be some considerable degree of continuity between the early Reformed theologians and late medieval thinkers such as Wycliffe and Huss). The expansion of the areas in which Scripture was recognized to be competent is one of the most significant features of the early Reformed church: even the authority and interpretation of Scripture were held to be based upon Scripture itself, and not upon the church – *scriptura sui ipsius interpres*.

This does not, however, account for the intellectual origins of the *Lutheran* Reformation. In his remarkably perceptive account of the relation between the *sola scriptura* principle and the Lutheran Reformation, Kropatschek observed that the principle – which he rightly saw to have been a theological commonplace in the medieval period – was rendered sterile and useless through the absence of a proper hermeneutical scheme by which it might be interpreted.[130] For Wycliffe and others, Scripture is interpreted as nothing more and nothing less than *lex divina*, to be contrasted with the *lex humana* of papal regulations and pronouncements.[131] Noting that Wycliffe is rightly regarded as an exponent of the "Scripture principle," he pointed out that Wycliffe's theology is thoroughly moralist in its general tone, with no distinction being recognized between *lex* and *evangelium*.[132]

A similar point may be made with regard to Huss, who treated Scripture as *lex Dei*, which was to be opposed to *leges humanas* deriving from the pope.[133] Scripture is thus treated as a divinely given source of law, of morals, of rules for the regulation of human behavior, superior to those laws and customs determined by human authority within the church. In many respects, the early radical proponents of the *sola scriptura* principle (such as Wycliffe and Huss) may be regarded as extending the scope of Scripture to embrace discipline, as well as doctrine, thus calling into question the methods of the decretalists and canon lawyers. In this respect, they may be regarded as forerunners of the Swiss Reformation (and how often the moralism of that Reformation in its early phase has been noted!) – but *not* of the Lutheran Reformation. The equation of *lex*, *scriptura*, and *evangelium*, implicit (and often explicitly stated) in the writings of such late medieval theologians was actually, if anything, a hindrance (rather than a catalyst) to the emergence of the reforming theology at Wittenberg. The crucial question at Wittenberg was not simply that of the *status* of Scripture, as *how it was to be interpreted* – a scholarly question that is all too frequently neglected, and one to which we now turn.

5

The Interpretation of Scripture

Neither establishing and translating the text of Scripture, nor recognizing its material sufficiency as a theological source, exhausts the issues attending its theological application. The critical question remains: how is Scripture to be *interpreted*? The Reformation principle of *sola scriptura* is rendered either meaningless or unusable without a reliable hermeneutical program. Scripture might indeed contain (or even be identical with) the Word of God – but an inability to interpret Scripture inevitably precludes access to that Word. In that Scripture was regarded as the primary foundation of theology throughout the medieval period, including the foundational era of the Reformation, it will be clear that an examination of biblical hermeneutics in the late medieval and Reformation periods is an integral part of this present study. The hermeneutical presuppositions of theologians inevitably exercise considerable influence over their theological conclusions. In this chapter, I propose to consider both the traditional medieval hermeneutical techniques and the new literary methods introduced by the humanists, with a view to establishing the relation of the hermeneutical methods of the Reformers to those of the late medieval period. We may therefore turn to consider the standard medieval hermeneutical tool: the *Quadriga*.

Scholasticism: The Fourfold Sense of Scripture

The difficulty of interpreting the different literary styles within both Old and New Testaments was recognized from the time of Clement of Alexandria and Origen onwards.[1] The distinction between the "literal" and "allegorical" (which initially appears to have meant little more than

"nonliteral") sense of Scripture originates from this period, and would surface as an issue of some importance in the Arian controversy of the fourth century.[2] It was, however, Augustine who transmitted to the medieval period the idea that there were a number of higher (that is, nonliteral) senses of Scripture, an idea that eventually became formalized in the hermeneutical device of the "fourfold sense of Scripture," or *Quadriga*.[3] In addition to the literal sense, three spiritual senses were to be distinguished: the *allegorical*, which concerns what is believed; the *anagogical*, which concerns what is hoped for; and the *tropological*, which concerns moral conduct.[4] The relation between these four senses was often summarized in the lines of the thirteenth-century Dominican, Augustine of Denmark:

> *Littera gesta docet; quid credas allegoria,*
> *Moralis quid agas; quo tendis, anagogia.*[5]

In order to prevent such a hermeneutical scheme degenerating into the arbitrary personal interpretation of Scripture, the theologians of the period insisted upon the priority of the literal sense of Scripture: nothing could be believed on the basis of any of the three spiritual senses of Scripture unless it had first been established on the basis of the literal sense.[6] In effect, this hermeneutical scheme was primarily intended to allow otherwise obscure, or apparently irrelevant, portions of Scripture to be harmonized with those whose meaning was clearer: a failure to permit such harmonization would be tantamount to conceding that theology was concerned merely with certain biblical texts, rather than the entire canon of Scripture.

This fourfold hermeneutical scheme is employed by the young Luther in his exposition of the Psalter in the period 1513–15.[7] Here the *Quadriga* is employed in keeping with the medieval tradition: thus, for example, Luther insists that the three spiritual senses are subordinate to the literal (historical) sense.[8] Indeed, even as late as 1519, Luther was prepared to defend the value of the *Quadriga* as an exegetical aid, provided that it was not abused.[9] Luther's use of this standard medieval hermeneutical device is of importance in relation to his deliberations concerning the meaning of the phrase "the righteousness of God" (*iustitia Dei*), in that some scholars have argued that Luther's theological breakthrough is a consequence of his recognition of the priority of the *tropological* sense of the phrase, which is interpreted as "faith in Christ"

(*fides Christi*).[10] Although this suggestion is questionable, it nevertheless indicates the importance of Luther's hermeneutical continuity with the medieval period to the study of his theological development.

In fact, it seems that Luther's early hermeneutics were considerably influenced by developments in the period 1503–15, which identified a crucial problem relating to the first of the four senses of Scripture – the literal sense. In that the remaining three senses were ultimately dependent upon this first sense, its importance in relation to the use of the *Quadriga* was considerable. The key development of the period was the emergence of a clear distinction between the "letter" and the "spirit" of Scripture.

Humanism: The Letter and the Spirit

The rise of the new humanist philological and textual techniques in the first two decades of the sixteenth century resulted in a new interest in the literal sense of Scripture. Thus whereas in his *Enchiridion* of 1503 Erasmus had shown a marked predilection for the spiritual sense of Scripture,[11] he subsequently came to lay increasing emphasis upon its grammatical sense. The literal sense, he now believed, could be uncovered through the application of the methods of literary and textual criticism.[12] For this reason, the exegete had to be competent in the sacred languages. While showing himself aware of the *Quadriga*,[13] Erasmus criticizes it in several respect, especially in that it lends itself to a theologically driven hermeneutic that imposes theologically predetermined interpretations on obscure passages of Scripture.[14] The biblical text possesses a self-authenticating authority, and its meaning cannot be determined by the imposition of alien means of interpretation.

Despite Erasmus's own earlier flirtations with the ingenuities of allegorical interpretation, he later came to hold that the spirit remains bound to the letter. Erasmus thus developed a hermeneutical program in which the literal sense of Scripture was first established on the basis of the new scientific literary, textual, and philological techniques, before its spiritual senses were further developed.[15] Of those spiritual senses, it is clear that the tropological or moral was regarded as primary by Erasmus. Erasmus appears to have held that biblical language, when properly interpreted, moved its audiences to act ethically, and hence elevated the moral sense of Scripture above others.[16] Thus he observes

that, while any passage can be interpreted tropologically, not all may be interpreted allegorically.[17] An illustration of this tropological exegesis may be found in his interpretation of the *fides Abraam*: Abraham's faith serves as an example of virtue, which may be contrasted with a sterile reliance upon circumcision and other such Old Testament ceremonies.[18]

This emphasis upon the literal sense of Scripture, however, raised a serious difficulty: the literal exegesis of the Old Testament would thence seem destined to be nothing more than *Judaica expositio*. In an important letter to Wolfgang Capito of February 26, 1517, Erasmus drew attention to precisely this danger: the literal exegesis of the Old Testament was potentially the seedbed of a revived Judaism, which could pose a serious threat to the Christian faith.[19] Although this point had been appreciated for some considerable time, the return *ad fontes* associated with the late Renaissance and early Reformation made it an acutely sensitive area. How could the literal exegesis of the Old Testament be undertaken without reverting to Judaism? Was there not a danger that an appeal to the literal sense of Scripture would become an exercise in *midrash* or *peshat*?[20] The problem was compounded still further through the need to gain the necessary philological techniques to handle the Hebrew text of the Old Testament: the philological works most frequently consulted by Christian Hebraists (such as Reuchlin's *De rudimentibus*) were actually written by Jews. In addition, several important exegetical works of the early Reformation period – such as Bucer's commentary on the Psalter (1529) – drew heavily upon medieval rabbinical sources, such as David Kimhi and Abraham Ibn Ezra (of the medieval Hispano-Provençal *peshat* school) and Solomon ben Isaac (Rashi) of Troyes.[21]

Despite these evident difficulties, Bucer indicates that his commentary on the Psalter represents an attempt to interpret an Old Testament text strictly upon the basis of the historical (or literal) sense. Three reasons are given for this procedure: first, it is this form of exegesis alone that will command respect from Jews;[22] second, it alone can withstand the assault of academic disputation; third, doctrine is ultimately based upon this sense of Scripture.[23] It will thus be clear that the new emphasis upon the historical sense of the Old Testament text, linked with the need for reliable philological insights into the Hebrew text, inevitably meant that sixteenth-century Christian Hebraists and Jews found themselves engaged in (an ultimately indecisive) battle on this terrain. The need to distinguish the Jewish and Christian historical

understandings of the historical sense was thus perceived to be both important and urgent. Yet no easy answer was forthcoming. The seriousness of the issue can be seen with respect to John Calvin's Old Testament hermeneutics, which came in for severe criticism from his Lutheran opponents. In 1595, Aegidius Hunnius argued that Calvin was a Judaizer, in that he failed to interpret the Old Testament consistently in a Christological manner.[24]

A partial solution to this difficulty appears to have emerged during the first decade of the sixteenth century, and is associated with Jacques Lefèvre d'Etaples. For Lefèvre, the only literal sense of any importance is the Christological, "*qui scilicet est intentionis prophetae et Spiritus sancti in eo loquimus*."[25] Two literal senses may be recognized: the false, carnal literal sense of the rabbinical exegesis, which applies the words of the psalmist or prophet only to the specific historical situation pertaining at the time of writing, and the true literal sense ("as the Holy Spirit intends") which interprets such words as applying to Christ. The true sense of Scripture is thus not the tropological, the anagogical, or allegorical, but the literal sense – a literal sense, that is, that discloses its hidden Christological spiritual sense through the illumination of the Holy Spirit.[26] In making this assertion, Lefèvre draws upon a tradition that can be traced back to Nicolas of Lyra.[27] Lyra argues that there are points – such as Isaiah 11.1 – where it is clear that the Old Testament writer refers to Christ, and not to Israel, hence necessitating the recognition of a double literal sense, one applying to the time of the prophet, or the Old Testament, the second applying to Christ, or the New Testament. A similar theory is developed by Paul of Burgos.[28]

Lefèvre designates these two literal senses as the *sensus literalis historicus* and the *sensus literalis propheticus*, corresponding to the "literal-carnal" and "literal-spiritual" senses respectively.[29] To read the Old Testament as a series of narratives dealing with the history of ancient Near Eastern semitic tribes is to miss the deeper meaning to the text, brought out by the Holy Spirit. Drawing on Augustine's distinction, based upon 2 Corinthians 3.6, between the killing *litera* and life-giving *spiritus*,[30] Lefèvre identifies the former with the historical sense of the Old Testament, and the latter with its prophetic sense. In that Lefèvre's *Quincuplex Psalterium* was widely used by early sixteenth-century commentators anxious to deal with the Hebrew text of the Psalter at first hand, its considerable influence upon Old Testament exegesis in the second decade of the sixteenth century comes as no surprise. Thus the noted

Tübingen exegete Wendelin Steinbach insisted that, in its literal sense, the Old Testament must be taken as referring to Christ and his church.[31] For our purposes, however, the most important application of Lefèvre's *litera–spiritus* dialectic is Martin Luther's *Dictata super Psalterium* (1513–15), to which we shall turn presently. We begin by considering the importance of hermeneutics to the origins of Zwingli's reforming theology, and that of his successors.

Hermeneutics and the Origins of the Reformed Church

Any account of early Reformed hermeneutics must be primarily concerned with the development of the exegetical methods and presuppositions of Huldrych Zwingli. In an earlier chapter, the considerable influence of humanist literary and textual techniques upon the development of the theology of the early Reformed church was noted. That same influence must now be considered in relation to the exegetical techniques employed in the interpretation of Scripture.

Erasmus's initial preference for Origenistic allegorical exegesis, which gradually gave way (through the development of his philological techniques) to an increased emphasis upon the literal word of Scripture, has already been described. The comparison of Zwingli and Erasmus in regard to their biblical hermeneutics has frequently been grossly confused through the tendency to assume that the latter's *Enchiridion* (1503) embodies his definitive hermeneutical program – whereas it is evident that, as his philological work developed, Erasmus's hermeneutics altered accordingly.[32] The man who edited the New Testament in 1516 was no longer the young humanist who wrote the *Enchiridion* in 1503. As is evident from a comparison between Erasmus's Matthew paraphrase of January 14, 1522 and Zwingli's important *Von clarheit und gewüsse oder unbetrogliche des wort gottes* of September 6 of the same year, the two men demonstrate a remarkable degree of convergence in their presuppositions, methods, and doctrines. Although questions relating to the natural human capacities (the freedom of the will, and the pedagogic aspect of the Reformation, discussed previously, being obvious examples) divide the two men, it is evident that in many other respects they are in agreement,[33] both in regard to the importance of Scripture and the manner in which it is to be interpreted.

Zwingli makes extensive use of the distinction between the "natural" and nonliteral senses of Scripture. In common with the medieval tradition, he insists that nothing should be believed that is established on the basis of a nonliteral sense of Scripture, unless it can first be demonstrated on the basis of the letter of Scripture. The spiritual senses should be regarded as the embellishment of an exegetical argument, rather than its foundation.[34] Like Erasmus, Zwingli insisted that the best possible exegetical aids (such as a knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek languages, and of the various figures of speech employed in Scripture) should be employed in an effort to establish the natural sense of Scripture.[35] The humanist influence is perhaps at its most evident in the emphasis that Zwingli lays upon the philological-historical method, which is given far greater weight than his colleagues at Wittenberg would ever allow. Furthermore, Zwingli draws extensively upon humanist rhetorical theory in his attempt to distinguish various tropes, such as alloiosis, catachresis, and synecdoche, which were of potential theological significance.

The influence of humanism upon Zwingli is most evident in his early exegetical works, such as his marginal comments of 1516–17 to Erasmus's *Novum Instrumentum*.[36] At every point Zwingli depends upon Erasmus: his translation of the text, his textual criticism, his illustrations, and his patristic references. Indeed, in terms of the *testimonia patrum* he employs, the strongly Origenistic bias of Erasmus is evident, particularly in his exposition of natural law, the nature of sin, and eschatology. Finally, the anthropocentricity of Zwingli's exegesis is evident, here paralleling the younger Erasmus. Attention has also been drawn to the manner in which Zwingli uses humanist rhetorical techniques to deal with the inner meaning of a scriptural text, and particularly the extensive use of pagan classical authors in the course of his exegesis[37] – once more, indicating the considerable influence of humanism at this point. The Erasmian emphasis upon the tropological or moral sense of Scripture is also evident in Zwingli's exegesis. Scripture takes the form of moral guidance to believers, indicating the human acts and dispositions that are regarded as appropriate for the gospel, and providing examples to illuminate their application. Thus Zwingli emphasizes the moral dimension of Scripture, drawing attention to the contemporary moral relevance of Old Testament *exempla*. Zwingli's development of the Erasmian concept of the tropological sense of Scripture (although Zwingli does not appear to use either this term, or the related term

sensus moralis) clearly indicates his moralist concerns, and sets him apart from the young Luther in this crucial respect.

Despite the intense humanist preoccupation with the natural sense of Scripture, noted above, Zwingli argues that Paul's use of the Old Testament legitimates the use of allegory in its interpretation (with 2 Corinthians 8.15 and Galatians 4.22–6 functioning as "proof-texts"). Zwingli thus distinguishes between the literal sense of the Old Testament and its spiritual meaning. To read the Old Testament according to the letter is to adopt the carnal exegetical methods of the Jews, referring such accounts to an earthly Israel or Jerusalem; rather, it should be read in a spiritual manner, as prefiguring something that was accomplished and perfected in Christ.[38] Even here, the influence of humanism cannot be overlooked, particularly in view of the Origenist allegorizing characteristic of Erasmus's earlier works, such as the *Enchiridion*. In effect, Zwingli treats what Lefèvre termed the *sensus literalis historicus* as the natural sense, and the *sensus literalis propheticus* as the spiritual sense, although the parallel is not exact. Zwingli's understanding of the nature and relation of these senses is highly idiosyncratic, and requires careful analysis.

For Zwingli, concrete historical events recounted in the Old Testament possessed a deeper symbolical meaning. As an accommodation to human weakness, God prefigured what would eventually be accomplished and fulfilled in Christ in the form of external events or persons. Zwingli thus employs the term "allegory" to refer to that mode of scriptural exegesis that is to be contrasted with a purely literal and carnal exegesis of the Old Testament.[39] In an important study, Edwin Künzli demonstrated that Zwingli's complex (and possibly incoherent) use of allegory could be explained with some success if a distinction was drawn between "typology" and "allegory."[40] The "typological" exegesis was primarily concerned with the Christological interpretation of individuals or events in the Old Testament as "types" of Christ, and the "allegorical" with passages where there was some uncertainty regarding the exegesis. In fact, however, Zwingli's use of both the term and concept of allegory is so broad and diffuse that it is difficult to analyze convincingly.[41] The chief difficulty is that, despite his critique of those who imposed arbitrary interpretations upon obscure passages,[42] Zwingli appears to be forced to do precisely the same thing himself. On the basis of his own understanding of the natural sense, therefore, Zwingli is able to "read back" his own theology into otherwise obscure

passages, thus inevitably laying himself open to the accusation of indulging in *eisegesis* rather than *exegesis*.[43]

The influence of Erasmian humanism is perhaps even more marked upon the hermeneutics of Martin Bucer.[44] Earlier (pp. 53–4), we noted how Bucer took up and developed Erasmus's concept of the gospel as *lex Christi*, establishing as axiomatic the principle *nam et sacra doctrina proprie moralis est*. Bucer thus treats the tropological exegesis of Scripture – the essentially timeless application of any biblical statement to practical piety on the grounds that it may be said to be *propter nos* – as fundamental.[45] The Old Testament histories must thus be regarded as having something significant to say to contemporary piety, rather than as purely historical narratives. Particularly in the emphasis upon *imitatio*, Bucer approximates closely to Erasmus. Thus Bucer follows Zwingli in asserting that Scripture was written for our sake,[46] and not merely as an objective and disinterested account of God's dealings with humanity.

Bucer's emphasis upon *imitatio* allows him to interpret both the existential and moral statements of Scripture pedagogically, with Christ being treated as the *unicus magister*, the prototype whom Christians are under an obligation to follow.[47] In this respect, Bucer's scriptural exegesis can be regarded as both a continuation of the spirituality of the *devotio moderna* and a precursor of seventeenth-century Pietism. It will also be evident that the apparent similarity between Bucer and the young Luther (in that both lay emphasis upon the tropological sense of Scripture) is misleading: although both understand the tropological sense to refer to the existential dimension of Scripture, Luther regards it as the work of Christ within humanity, whereas Bucer treats it as an example to be imitated by humanity, through the assistance of the Holy Spirit.

In one important respect, Bucer may be regarded as a more faithful interpreter than Zwingli of the later Erasmus. Despite Erasmus's increasing emphasis upon the literal sense of Scripture, Zwingli had made extensive use of allegorization, particularly in relation to the interpretation of the Old Testament. Bucer rejects the use of allegory, in that it permits any meaning to be read into, or imposed upon, a passage, thus allowing its direct meaning to be overlooked or lost.[48] This is not to say, however, that Bucer abstains from the use of allegory altogether: rather, he appears to employ the device to a limited extent when the meaning is unequivocal.[49] It is not, however, treated as the primary

sense of Scripture – and here Bucer shows his affinities with the later Erasmus, rather than the author of the *Enchiridion*. Whereas the young Erasmus regarded allegory as the means of distinguishing letter and spirit, Bucer's theology of the Holy Spirit as the authentic interpreter of Scripture, who allows the believer to read the text *ex intento auctoris*, allows him to dispense with this unreliable hermeneutical tool.

From this brief survey of early Reformed biblical hermeneutics, it will be evident that late medieval exegetical methods – such as the *Quadriga* – exercised little, if any, influence in this field. The hermeneutics of both Zwingli and Bucer may both be regarded as fundamentally Fabrisian or Erasmian, and their theological program as an attempt to return *ad fontes*, to interpret Scripture in terms of its own parameters, rather than in terms of an imposed hermeneutical framework – *scriptura sui ipsius interpres*. The strongly moralist cast of early Reformed theology, linked with the Erasmian concept of *imitatio*, serves only to emphasize the differences between the early Reformed and Lutheran approaches to Scripture. If the intellectual origins of the Reformation are to be explained in terms of the return to Scripture as the source of Christian theology, the considerable divergence within the movement over the question of hermeneutics raises serious questions concerning the viability of this approach. The radical divergence within the Reformation as a whole, as well as within both the Lutheran and Reformed wings of that movement, over the exegesis of the sixth chapter of the Fourth Gospel, illustrates how wide the rift between the various Reformers could be when hermeneutical *cruces* (especially those apparently employing nonliteral statements) could be. A further point is all too often overlooked: the *political* hermeneutics that served to propagate the Reformation in Switzerland and southern Germany during the third decade of the sixteenth century owed little, if anything, to the more theological hermeneutics that were being developed by Zwingli and others.

The importance of the "First Zurich Disputation" of January 29, 1523 in connection with the origins of the Reformed church has already been noted (pp. 44–5). The conclusions of this disputation are often regarded as a civic endorsement of Zwingli's reforming program, establishing the *sola scriptura* principle as normative in matters of doctrine and preaching. In fact, however, it is clear that the city council introduced a subtle twist to the hermeneutical debate then raging within Zurich, by declaring that it was the city council itself (more strictly,

the Lesser Council) that had the authority to determine what was in accordance with Scripture, and what was not.[50] The outcome of the First Disputation was initially interpreted by the Lesser Council to mean that any teaching or practice might be permitted, subject to the provision that it be shown to have a formal basis in Scripture. A similar decision was reached at Basle at the end of May 1523.[51] In both cases, the council's decision appears to have been conceived as an "Interim" – a formula designed to gain time before a final decision on the matters under consideration was reached. Thus Zwingli was informed that he might continue his preaching until he should be informed of a better theology (by the council).[52] In fact, the Lesser Council adopted a remarkably moderate approach to the question of formal agreement with Scripture, refusing, for example, to allow the Zwinglian faction to paint the interiors of Zurich's churches in white. Contemporary sources suggest that only a minority of the Lesser Council were favorably disposed toward the evangelical faction,[53] with the result that the Zurich political scriptural hermeneutic tended to be surprisingly conservative. This situation changed significantly on January 11, 1524, when the Greater Council relieved the Lesser of its duty to interpret Scripture, and assumed this office itself. That which radical evangelicals such as Sprüngli had wished to see happen at Zurich, only to have it blocked by the Lesser Council, subsequently took place through the enhanced (if self-appropriated) spiritual authority of the Greater Council.

The extent of the progress of the Reformation at Zurich, as elsewhere, was thus determined by political considerations, largely concerning the city council.[54] At Zurich, and subsequently elsewhere in Switzerland and southern Germany, the Reformation was propagated through public disputations based upon the *sola scriptura* principle. As this chapter has suggested, Scripture requires interpretation – and the political dimension of the Zurich Reformation in particular (and the Swiss and southern German Reformation in general) was such that it was a *political* body that appropriated the authority to determine what was in accordance with Scripture, and what was not. In other words, whatever the hermeneutics of the early theological proponents of the Reformation may have been, a secondary hermeneutic of political character was at least on occasion instrumental in the propagation of that movement.

It will thus be evident that the question of how the early Reformed theological communities interpreted Scripture was more problematic than is sometimes appreciated. It is therefore of interest to turn to the

question of how biblical interpretation was implicated in both the origins and consolidation of their Lutheran counterparts.

Hermeneutics and the Origins of the Lutheran Church

For Luther, as for the medieval tradition in general, the literal sense of Scripture is fundamental.[55] However, Luther recognized the necessity of distinguishing *two* literal senses of Scripture, and developed a hermeneutical scheme that is best regarded as a combination of the traditional fourfold sense of Scripture with Lefèvre's distinction between the *sensus literalis historicus* and *sensus literalis propheticus*, thus yielding *eight* senses of Scripture.[56] Luther develops this point – playfully, it would seem – by considering the eight senses that the phrase "Mount Zion" might bear, on the basis of this scheme.[57]

- Taking the term in its literal-historical sense – "the killing letter" (*litera occidens*), as Luther terms it, following Lefèvre – the following four senses may be deduced. In its literal sense, it refers to the land of Canaan; in its allegorical sense, to the synagogue; in its tropological sense, to the righteousness of the law; in its anagogical sense, to the future glory of the flesh.
- Taking the term in its literal-prophetic sense – "the life-giving spirit" (*spiritus vivificans*), as Luther terms it – four very different senses may be deduced. In its literal sense, it refers to the people of Zion; in its allegorical sense, to the church; in its tropological sense, to the righteousness of faith; in its anagogical sense, to the eternal glory of the heavens.

This eightfold distinction allows Luther to develop two important points. First, he argues that Christ is the *sensus principalis* of Scripture.[58] In other words, the literal-prophetic sense of Scripture gives rise to a Christological concentration. Second, he argues that the entire distinction between law and gospel is contained in the correlative distinction between *litera* and *spiritus*: the former merely makes (impossible) demands of humanity, whereas the latter enables humanity to fulfill them. We shall consider these two points further, beginning with Luther's "Christological concentration."

Luther follows in the tradition of Augustine by treating the Psalter as an essentially *Christological* text. Christ is the key to the text that he proposes to expound.[59] Thus Luther opens his exposition with the affirmation "PRAEFATIO IHESV CHRISTI filii dei et domini nostri in Psalterium DAVID."[60] David was a prophet, and the substance of his prophecy is none other than Christ himself.[61] For this reason, Luther criticizes Lyra for his failure to bring out the full significance of the prophetical sense of the text, arguing that to interpret the text *historice*, rather than *prophetice*, is to use a rabbinical tool to develop a Judaized interpretation of the text. For Luther, as we have seen, the *sensus literalis* is the *sensus propheticus*. The danger that Luther emphasizes is that of mistaking the shadow for the substance, or the sign for the thing that is signified.[62] For Luther, the substance that is foreshadowed in the Old Testament is Christ;[63] the thing signified by the law is the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.[64] Thus the New Testament, and supremely its Christological elements, is essentially the law of Moses understood according to the spirit – in other words, *litera* become *spiritus*.[65] In a remarkable turn of phrase, that clearly foreshadows (or may even already express) the *theologia crucis*, Luther argues that the literal-historical sense is *sensus in dorso*, whereas the literal-prophetic sense is *sensus in facie*.[66] This Christological exposition of the Psalter, although traditional in its results, nevertheless draws upon the more recent exegetical methods associated with Lefèvre d'Etaples, also taken up by catholic exegetes (such as Steinbach) at the same time. It is therefore important to notice that Luther's hermeneutics at this point are characteristic of the period. If any genuine theological breakthrough took place during Luther's exposition of the Psalter, it would seem that that breakthrough did not occur on account of any radical new hermeneutical insights.

The dialectic between *lex* and *evangelium* is the second major aspect of Luther's hermeneutics. The law of Moses, according to Luther, may be understood according to the letter as a visible external righteousness, valid *coram hominibus* but not *coram Deo*.[67] It may alternatively be understood according to the spirit as the gospel of grace (hence Luther's occasional reference to the gospel as *lex spiritualis*,[68] meaning "the law understood according to the spirit"). Luther emphasizes that the gospel may also be misunderstood as *litera*, and thus reduced to law: the crucial distinction between *litera* and *spiritus* is not confined to the period of the Old Testament. (In this assertion may be detected the

dialectic between law and gospel that is so characteristic a feature of his thought in the period 1519–25.) The essential unity of the Old and New Testaments is grounded in a correct understanding of the dialectic between *litera* and *spiritus*. Life according to the letter is characterized by unbelief, pride, and rebellion against God, whereas life according to the spirit is characterized by faith, humility, and obedience to God. It is perhaps therefore hardly surprising that Luther declares that the ability to distinguish letter and spirit is the hallmark of the true theologian.[69]

Luther's early biblical exegesis is therefore essentially based upon the medieval scholastic *Quadriga*, with the three spiritual senses of Scripture subordinated to the literal-prophetic sense.[70] Luther, in fact, tends to play down the anagogical, and shows an increasing interest in the tropological sense of Scripture.[71] It is at this point that an important difference between Luther on the one hand, and Erasmus and Bucer on the other, must be noted. For Erasmus, the tropological sense of Scripture is concerned with the moral demands that are made of the believer. Thus his discussion of the faith of Abraham ends with an exhortation to children to emulate the virtues of their parents.[72] Luther, however, adopts a quite different understanding of this sense of Scripture: for him the tropological sense refers to the gracious work of Jesus Christ in the individual believer, so that the *bonum tropologicum* is to be defined as faith.[73] As Ebeling points out, Luther treats the concept as pertaining to God's *acta* rather than human *facta*:[74] "*Via dei est, qua nos ambulare facit*."[75] Thus Luther interprets *iudicium Dei, iustitia Dei*, and similar terms tropologically in terms of what God *does for* humanity, rather than in terms of what God *expects of* humanity.[76]

At this point, Luther diverges from the medieval hermeneutical tradition, and it is far from clear precisely why he should do so. The possible (but disputed) importance of the tropological sense of *iustitia Dei* to his theological breakthrough gives added emphasis to the importance of establishing the origins of Luther's views on the tropological sense.[77] The following suggestion may be of some use in this respect. It is evident that Luther regards the central message of Scripture – both Old and New Testaments – to concern the *acta Dei*. Three particular arenas of this work of God are identified: the *acta Dei* in Christ, in the church, and in the individual believer.[78] Luther's frequently repeated assertion that power lies with God in the divine Word, rather than within humanity,[79] inevitably leads to an emphasis upon *acta Dei*, rather

than *facta nostra*. This is evident in Luther's use of the allegorical sense of Scripture to refer to God's *acta* within the church, and consistency would suggest that a similar approach should be encountered in relation to the tropological sense, which concerns *acta Dei in nobis* rather than *facta nostra pro Deo*.

These points should be borne in mind in considering the important thesis developed by Karl Bauer, according to which the origins of Luther's reforming theology are to be explained upon the basis of the development of a new hermeneutic.[80] This new hermeneutic, according to Bauer, was characterized by two leading features. The first was an emphasis upon the Christological orientation of Scripture; the second, the tendency to treat the immediate practical concerns of the individual believer as the primary concern of the exegete. According to Bauer, this new hermeneutic was derived by Luther from Staupitz, and emerged in the period 1516–19.[81] The suggestion that Luther's hermeneutical insights were derived from Staupitz seems improbable in the light of recent research,[82] and is probably best regarded as an initially fruitful, but now untenable, suggestion. The associated suggestion that Luther's reforming theology is the direct consequence of the discovery of a new hermeneutic is considerably more exciting, and requires careful evaluation.

The first point to be considered is the dating of Luther's theological breakthrough. Although the debate is still unresolved,[83] it is clear that Luther's theology of justification was totally transformed by the year 1516. By this time, a "new" understanding of the vital theologoumenon "the righteousness of God" (*iustitia Dei*) had been established, and the priority of God over humanity in justification unequivocally stated.[84] This is not necessarily to assert that Luther's theological breakthrough is to be identified with his new theology of justification, although it is evident that it is its central feature.[85] Luther's theology of justification, as we noted earlier, was initially (1513) that of the *via moderna*, and was subjected to gradual modification over the period 1513–15 as new insights appeared. These new insights into the justification of humanity *coram Deo* were essentially complete by early 1516, and almost certainly date from 1515.[86] Since Bauer had suggested that Luther's new hermeneutic dates from 1516–19, it would seem that his thesis concerning the hermeneutical basis of Luther's reforming theology faces some difficulties, not least in that the origins of that theology appear to *antedate* the adoption of his reforming hermeneutic.

The seriousness of this difficulty is considerably lessened by recognition of the fact that important hermeneutical developments are already evident in the *Dictata super Psalterium* itself.[87] Although Luther's new hermeneutic is indeed to be associated with the period 1516–19, important anticipations of its leading features may be found in the period 1513–15.[88] For this reason, the possibility that Luther's reforming theology owes its origins to new hermeneutical insights is still plausible.

It is evident that, although Luther continues to employ the *Quadriga* throughout the *Dictata* – and, indeed, would continue to regard it as a permissible hermeneutical tool for some years to come – an important modification to that fourfold scheme takes place within the *Dictata*. Although Luther *initially* follows the medieval tradition in general in insisting that the *literal* (that is, literal-prophetic, to use Lefèvre's terms) sense of Scripture is fundamental, by the end of the *Dictata*, we find him insisting with equal vehemence that it is the *tropological* sense that is fundamental: "*sensus tropologicus ultimatus et principaliter intentus in scriptura.*"[89] We have already noted how Luther eschews the traditional moral interpretation of the *sensus tropologicus*,[90] regarding it instead as a means of illuminating the work of God in Christ within humanity. As Ebeling has pointed out, it is the tropological sense that Luther comes to regard as embodying the existential dimension of the gospel,[91] in that it represents and articulates the existential impact of Christ upon the believer. The significance of such concepts as *iustitia Dei* and *iudicium Dei* lies in the Christologically derived existential impact that they have upon the believer – and Luther's 1516–19 emphasis upon the immediate practical religious concerns of the individual believer is unquestionably foreshadowed here.

The strongly subjective dimension of Luther's exegesis, which is so intimately linked with the development of his theology ofjustification, is evident in the manner in which he transforms the *Quadriga* to the point at which it must be questioned whether he continues to use it at all.[92] The literal-prophetic and the tropological senses are increasingly viewed as one and the same thing, as the perceived signficance of Christ *pro nobis* comes to be identified as the supreme Christological insight of Scripture. In view of Luther's idiosyncratic understanding of the *sensus tropologicus*, it would therefore seem that Luther's theological development over the crucial period 1513–15 took place *within*, but not necessarily *on account of*, the traditional medieval hermeneutical scheme. It is beyond dispute that Luther was able to employ the

tropological sense of Scripture as a vehicle for the development of his distinctive theology – but the evidence does not permit the conclusion that it was the occasion, still less the cause, of that development. The evidence suggests that Luther's hermeneutical and soteriological insights developed symbiotically, with each dimension to his thought reinforcing and stimulating the other, until eventually the traditional framework of the *Quadriga* proved incapable of restraining the radical new theology that had developed within it.

Just as Luther's soteriological insights initially failed to gain general acceptance within the Wittenberg theological faculty, so his hermeneutical insights failed in the same way, and perhaps to an even greater extent. The most important document relating to the hermeneutics of the Wittenberg university theology in the period 1516–19 is Karlstadt's theses of May 1518. For Karlstadt, the fundamental sense of Scripture is the literal sense: authoritative theological argumentation must be based upon this sense.[93] In many respects, Karlstadt's dicta concerning the priority of the literal sense parallel those of his mentor, Thomas Aquinas,[94] reflecting in turn the medieval tradition as a whole. For Karlstadt, the meaning of a scriptural text (expressed in terms such as *verbi significatio* or *proprietas verborum*) can only be determined with reference to its literal sense.[95] But what is to be understood by the literal sense of Scripture?

In an important study, Bubenheimer has drawn attention to the importance of the juristic tradition for Karlstadt's hermeneutics.[96] The model upon which Karlstadt appears to base his understanding of the literal sense of Scripture is testamentary law. Thus the *circumstantiae scribentis* are not deemed relevant to the establishment of the literal sense. In marked contrast to Gerson and others, who insisted that the *sensus literalis* was determined by the intentions of the author, Karlstadt insists that the text *as written* is the primary object for investigation.[97] Karlstadt's frequent use of the term *sensus legibilis* is important in this context, as is his distinction between the "intrinsic" and "extrinsic" exposition of Scripture.[98] This radical narrowing of the concept of the "literal sense of Scripture" is of considerable importance in the development of the Reformation Scripture principle, which increasingly came to be based upon the written letter of Scripture.

For our present purposes, however, it is more important to note that Karlstadt – believing himself to be an authentic interpreter of Augustine – adopted an approach to the literal sense of Scripture that

was quite distinct from, and potentially diametrically opposed to, that of Luther in the same period. Although Karlstadt and Luther demonstrate significant convergence at points in their soteriology, this does not reflect common hermeneutical presuppositions, but if anything is to be accounted for on the basis of a shared mutual respect for Augustine. The remarkable application of the tropological sense of Scripture, so characteristic of Luther's formative period, is conspicuous by its absence, and – if anything – is the subject of implicit criticism within Karlstadt's 1518 hermeneutical theses. The Wittenberg university theology was not based upon a common hermeneutical program: indeed, the ultimate unifying basis of that theology remains remarkably elusive.[99] The Wittenberg theology may indeed have been characterized by a return to the "Bible and Augustine" – yet there appears to have been little agreement on the mode of interpretation of the first of these sources within the Wittenberg faculty in the crucial period 1516–18.[100]

It is, nevertheless, significant that early Lutheran hermeneutics demonstrate significant continuity with those of the later medieval period. In particular, Luther's hermeneutics are clearly continuous with the scholastic *Quadriga*, the chief innovation (the use of Lefèvre's concept of the *sensus literalis propheticus*) being paralleled among other scholastic exegetes of the period, such as Wendelin Steinbach. Although the evidence suggests that hermeneutical developments may be of lesser significance in relation to Luther's theological development than was formerly thought to be the case, those developments initially took place within a hermeneutical (and also soteriological) framework well established in certain theological circles by the year 1510. The framework within which the intellectual origins of the Wittenberg Reformation are to be sought was bequeathed to its chief propagators by the Middle Ages.

In this present chapter, the hermeneutics of the early Reformed and Lutheran theological communities have been examined, and found to have relatively little in common. The general Reformation principle of a return *ad fontes* was not accompanied by universal agreement, or anything even approaching this, regarding how Scripture might be interpreted. While it is unquestionably true that many of the divergences within the early Reformation, particularly in relation to sacramental theology, arise from prior disagreement over hermeneutics, it is difficult to sustain the thesis that the distinctive foundational ideas of the Reformation themselves arose on account of a novel hermeneutic,

even in the case of Luther himself. In fact, as the following chapter will show, there are excellent reasons for supposing that the *testimonium patrum* – the witness of the fathers – may have exercised a considerable restraining influence over both early Lutheran and Reformed hermeneutics, compensating to a significant extent for the absence of a general hermeneutical consensus. We shall therefore move directly to a consideration of the role of the *testimonium patrum* in the theological method of the Reformers.

6

The Patristic Testimony

In recent years, there has been considerable interest in the way in which theological writers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries received and appropriated the legacy of the church fathers.[1] Two fundamental motivations may be discerned for this burgeoning interest in the patristic theological heritage. First, the Renaissance insistence that cultural renewal must take place by returning *ad fonts* led to a new fascination with the writings of the fathers, both Greek and Latin. Humanist writers tended to eschew specifically theological criteria of evaluation for such writings, regarding the antiquity of such writings in themselves as an adequate foundation for their authority. Others, however, sought to supplement this minimalist approach, either by introducing theological criteria (tending to focus on the theological orthodoxy of Augustine), or by adding additional cultural considerations, such as the eloquence of their language (often leading to a special appreciation of Origen).

The second factor was the growing emphasis within medieval theology, particularly within the Augustinian order, on source-critical issues. For many writers linked with the *schola Augustiniana moderna*, it was essential to establish the precise parameters of Augustine's theology through accurate textual analysis before deploying logico-critical techniques in order to develop their theological potential. Gregory of Rimini is widely regarded as having been a major influence in the consolidation of this trend.

So what role did this growing interest in the theological heritage of the patristic era play in the emergence of the Reformation? All the evidence suggests that the increased appreciation of the importance of the *testimonia patrum* did not play a critical role in relation to the intellectual origins of the Reformation. At no point can the patristic

theological inheritance be identified as being of decisive importance in bringing about the Reformation. Yet the *testimonia patrum* is of major importance to our investigation, as a close reading of the manner in which the first Reformers engaged with the fathers, and the extent of their appropriation of their ideas, helps clarify a fundamental divergence between the origins of the Lutheran and Reformed theological communities. While neither community regarded the fathers as *critical* to their task, they nevertheless regarded them as important, both to the theological task of interpreting Scripture, and to the apologetic task of refuting charges of innovation or heterodoxy brought against them by their opponents. The heterogenerity of the intellectual origins of the two wings of the Reformation, which has been a growing concern of this volume, is confirmed by the manners in which they deal with the patristic heritage.

The Scholastic Reception of Augustine

The influence of the patristic heritage, and supremely the thought of Augustine of Hippo, upon the development of Christian thought during the medieval period is beyond dispute.[2] Indeed, the theology of the medieval period may be regarded as thoroughly Augustinian to the extent that it was virtually a series of footnotes to Augustine: theological speculation was essentially regarded as an attempt to defend, develop, and, where necessary, modify, the Augustinian legacy. Anselm of Canterbury virtually equated orthodoxy with the views of the "catholic fathers, and especially Augustine."[3] The standard textbook of medieval theology, still in use in the sixteenth century, was Peter Lombard's *Sentences* – a collection of patristic *dicta*, drawn largely from the writings of Augustine. The Lombard's book may be regarded as developing the procedure found in Prosper of Aquitaine's *Liber sententiarum ex operibus Augustini*, which is often pointed to as an early representative of "medieval Augustinianism" – an attempt to bring together the main features of Augustine's theology, in order that they might be identified and developed.[4] The theological renaissance of the twelfth century, which may be regarded as laying the foundations for the theology of the medieval period as a whole, was largely based upon the writings of Augustine. In every major sphere of theological debate, the point of departure appears to have been the views of Augustine.[5]

The chief difficulty facing the theologians of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries was that Augustine's writings tended to be occasional, written in response to the challenges of his opponents, so that his theological distinctions and terminology were frequently shaped by these challenges. Thus Augustine's concepts of "operative" and "cooperative" grace were formulated in response to the Pelagian distinction between a "good will" and a "good act," and proved to be incapable of bearing the strain placed upon them in a period that was characterized by increasing precision and systematization.[6] A similar difficulty was encountered in connection with Augustine's emphatic assertion that humanity could not merit justification: what precisely was meant by the term "merit"? As theological systematization proceeded,[7] it became increasingly clear that the term "merit" could bear a number of senses, necessitating a reformulation of Augustine's rejection of merit prior to justification, while retaining the valid theological insight that his verbal formulations expressed.[8] The twelfth and early thirteenth centuries may be regarded as consolidating the Augustinian heritage by retaining the *dogmatic content* of that heritage, while restating it employing distinctions, terms, concepts, and methods unknown to Augustine himself. As the thirteenth century progressed, however, the process of reinterpreting Augustine appears to have become increasingly detached from its primary sources. There is every indication that Augustine's thought became obscured through the development of a tradition of Augustine interpretation. This process appears to have been catalyzed by a number of factors.

First, Augustine tended to be studied atomistically, in the form of isolated quotations, or "sentences," culled from his writings. In that the medieval reader of these sentences had no way of knowing their immediate context, the possibility of seriously misinterpreting such isolated Augustinian gobbets was ever present. The medieval Augustine interpretation tradition tended to treat such "sentences" as proof texts for the particular position being defended, without any real attempt to engage directly with the complete primary sources. Such sources, it may naturally be added, were not generally available in the medieval period, through the physical impossibility of transporting fragile manuscripts from one location to another. It is for this reason that the invention of printing and the production of the great Augustine editions of the early sixteenth century are so important – a point to which we shall return presently.

Secondly, numerous works were in circulation during the medieval period falsely purporting to be authentic writings of Augustine.[9] The authenticity of some such works had been called into question in the predestinarian controversies of the ninth century, in which the views of Augustine – for example, the *Hypomnesticon* – were treated as authoritative by both sides.[10] Other inauthentic works that were treated as authentic by medieval theologians included some that were thoroughly Pelagian, such as *De vita Christiana*,[11] thus confusing still further the already difficult task of interpreting Augustine's theology of grace. Perhaps the most influential work in establishing the medieval attitude to penance – a subject that would loom large in the Reformation debates – was the pseudo-Augustinian *De vera et falsa poenitentia*,[12] which propagated a view of penance that the Reformers would later dismiss as quasi-Pelagian. The widespread circulation and acceptance of such tracts created a serious problem for medieval theologians, in that it was not clear which of the various "sentences" in circulation embodied the authentic views of Augustine.

The only means by which this difficulty could be overcome was by intensive source-critical work, such as that characteristic of the revival of academic Augustinianism now recognized to be linked with the genesis of the *schola Augustiniana moderna* (see pp. 82–7). This may be illustrated by the recognition of the Pelagian character of the *Epistola ad Demetriadem* by both Thomas Bradwardine and Gregory of Rimini in the fourteenth century[13] (although this important conclusion did not gain general acceptance, both Johann Eck and Johannes Capreolus preferring to continue to ascribe the work to Jerome).[14] The source-critical work typical of this movement is evident in Gregory's *Commentary on the Sentences*, which appears to have been read as much as a source book for reliable and authentic Augustine gobbets as for the views of Gregory himself.[15] A further feature of the academic Augustinianism of the fourteenth century, characteristic of the *schola Augustiniana moderna* and its immediate precursor at Oxford, is its distinctive emphasis upon Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings (rather than, for example, his anti-Donatist works). In that Gregory of Rimini was widely recognized as *maximus et studiosissimus divi Augustini propugnator* – for example, by an influential sixteenth-century catholic theologian[16] – it is necessary to point out that this judgment was based upon Gregory's appeal to Augustine's doctrine of grace, as expounded in

the anti-Pelagian writings. It is significant that an important aspect of Gregory's critique of Bradwardine centered upon the latter's non-Augustinian views on the significance of the Fall (pp. 86–7).

The rise of source-critical studies, within the Augustinian Order and elsewhere, in the fourteenth century inevitably led to a reevaluation of the tradition-encrusted delineation of Augustine's theology, to the extent that it may be recognized as a rediscovery of the anti-Pelagian dimension to his thought. The rise of the ferociously anti-Pelagian soteriology of the *schola Augustiniana moderna* may be regarded as owing its origins, at least in considerable part, to the "rediscovery" of the anti-Pelagian theology of Augustine. The priority of Augustine's views on the doctrine of grace over the *testimonia patrum* in general was justified on the basis of the considerable parallels – both biographical and theological – between Augustine and St Paul. Both, as Bradwardine pointed out, were unbelievers who owed their conversion to the remarkable agency of divine grace (to use the terms of twentieth-century popular religion, both were "born again"), and who were thus well placed to speak of the sovereignty and precedence of divine grace over human actions.[17]

It is within this context of a continuing rereception and reevaluation of the theological, and especially the soteriological, legacy of Augustine in the late medieval period that the Reformation debates over its interpretation and the relative priority of its elements must be sought. All the Reformers valued Augustine – but to different extents, and for different reasons.[18] The potential tension between its various elements, highlighted through the Hussite controversy and still unresolved on the eve of the Reformation, may be regarded as a significant contribution to the intellectual origins of the Reformation. It was the conviction on the part of the Wittenberg Reformers that the church of their day had lapsed into some form of Pelagianism – irrespective of whether this conviction was justified or not – that forced them to address the question of the relative priority and theological significance of the anti-Donatist and anti-Pelagian writings. Thus, at least in Luther's view, the Reformation did not arise as the result of any *direct* ecclesiological argument, but simply on the basis of the evangelical conviction that the church of the early sixteenth century had defected from the gospel, and had hence compromised its credentials as a Christian church.[19] "The Reformation, inwardly considered, was just the ultimate triumph of

Augustine's doctrine of grace over Augustine's doctrine of the church."[20] Such was the importance that the Wittenberg Reformers came to attach to Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings that a theology of justification consistent with those writings came to function as a criterion of the catholicity of the church, and hence functioned both as a defining characteristic and as polemical device against their opponents for the evangelical faction in that city. Although the Reformation is often regarded as essentially a debate over the theological status and interpretation of Scripture, the partial truth of this statement has tended to obscure the fact that it was equally the continuation of a debate over the status, and supremely the interpretation, of *Augustine*, inherited from the late medieval period.

The particular form that the debate assumed in the first three decades of the sixteenth century was significantly influenced by the substantial humanist editorial undertakings, which gave to the sixteenth century the magnificent (by contemporary standards) Amerbach edition of Augustine's works.[21] This 11-volume edition was complete by 1506,[22] and although it is not clear when the enterprise began, there are certainly excellent reasons for supposing that it was under way by 1490, and possibly even 1489. The initial print run of this work appears to have been restricted to 200 copies of each volume,[23] which lends some plausibility to the suggestion that a second edition of the *Opera omnia Augustini* was produced at Paris in 1515. This hypothesis has become influential in relation to the investigation of the Augustine renaissance in the early sixteenth century: for example, wide circulation has been given to Kähler's suggestion that it was this edition of Augustine that Karlstadt purchased at the Leipzig book fair on April 13, 1517.[24] In fact, there was no 1515 edition of the Amerbach work: the suggestion that it was reprinted rests upon an error in an early catalog of the Bodleian Library, Oxford.[25] The error arose in this way: One of the nine 1506 volumes of the Amerbach edition was misplaced, and its place on the Bodleian bookshelf taken by Badius's edition of the sermons of Augustine, published at Paris in 1515. The error was noticed in the early twentieth century, and the missing Amerbach volume substituted for the Badius volume. Catalog entries prior to 1918 read thus: "D. Aurelius Augustinus, episc. Hipponensis . . . Opera IX Tom. per Amerbachium, & c. Bas. 1506 & Par. 1515." This gave the impression that there were *two* editions of the Amerbach work, one of which was published at Basle in 1506, the other at Paris in 1515.

The Humanist Reception of Augustine

The significant decline in patristic studies in general, and the study of Augustine in particular, associated with the later Middle Ages, was reversed through the invention of printing and the development of the new humanist editorial techniques, which combined to make available reliable editions of important patristic texts. The importance of this development to the nascent reforming movements in Germany and Switzerland can hardly be overstated. The same movement, however, that gave the Reformers their editions of Augustine also came to pose the most significant challenge to his theological authority. The humanist appeal to the *testimonia patrum* was essentially an appeal to antiquity, an aspect of the general desire to return *ad fontes*.

The fathers were to be preferred to the scholastics for three reasons: first, because of their superior Latin style; second, on account of their simplicity and elegance of theological expression; third, because of their chronological proximity to the period of the New Testament. In all these respects, the fathers were to be compared favorably with the scholastics, whose barbarous Latin, arcane theological terminology, and temporal distance from the documents they purported to interpret were sufficient, in humanist eyes, to discredit them theologically. It will be noted that none of the three criteria employed by the humanists can be regarded as "theological": the sole legitimate criteria, according to the humanists, were elegance and clarity of expression, and antiquity. At no point could "theological orthodoxy" be acknowledged as a criterion in this respect. It will therefore be evident that the humanist appeal to the *testimonia patrum* was essentially an appeal to the *patristic corpus as a whole*, and not to any particular theologian within it. An appeal to Augustine as *inter theologos summus* was to be rejected out of hand, as involving the application of an impermissible *theological* criterion. The humanist reevaluation (or, perhaps we should say, *devaluation*) of the significance of Augustine is perhaps best seen from the editorial undertakings of Erasmus.

Initially, as was noted in chapter 5 (p. 150), Erasmus demonstrated a marked preference for Origen among the fathers, apparently on account of his elegant allegorical method of scriptural exegesis. However, as Erasmus's own editorial undertakings in relation to the Greek text of the New Testament proceeded, it is evident that he began to regard his fellow editor and philologist Jerome with the greatest of respect. In a

significant letter to Leo X of May 21, 1515, Erasmus declared his intention to work toward the emergence of Jerome, "the only Latin theologian worthy of the name," as *inter theologos summus*.[26]

Erasmus's first Jerome edition appeared from the Froben press at Basle in nine volumes in 1516,[27] prefaced by a biography of Jerome that included a point-by-point comparison of Jerome and Augustine, invariably to the latter's detriment.[28] The theological significance of this development was not overlooked at the time. In a letter of February 1518, Johann Eck noted with distaste the manner in which Erasmus had toppled Augustine from his place of primacy among the fathers.[29] In the series of editions of patristic writings that followed in the period 1520–9, Augustine was treated simply as a patristic writer on the same level as Arnobius Junior (a noted critic of Augustine's doctrine of grace, interestingly), rather than as preeminent among them.[30] Furthermore, both Erasmus's second and third Jerome editions (1524 and 1533) retained the Pelagian *vita Hieronymi* that was found objectionable by the increasing number of those disposed to find the basis of the *vera theologia* in the anti-Pelagian writings of Augustine.

As has been suggested, the Reformation may be regarded as a continuation, and to a certain extent an intensification, of the sporadic late medieval debate concerning the reception of the anti-Pelagian thought of Augustine. The influence of the *testimonia patrum*, and particularly the *vera theologia nostri Augustini*, upon the intellectual origins of the Reformation is more complex than is generally appreciated. The two sections that follow will consider the influence of the patristic witness upon the development of both the Reformed and Lutheran theological communities. First, the developments at Zurich in the second decade of the sixteenth century are considered.

The Patristic Testimony and the Origins of the Reformed Church

Froben is reported to have given Zwingli a copy of one of the volumes of the Amerbach Augustine edition of 1506.[31] Although the library that Zwingli took with him from Glarus to Einsiedeln in 1516 included annotated copies of Augustine, including the 1515 edition of *De civitate Dei*, he does not appear to have used them extensively. At this point, Zwingli appears to follow Erasmus in his predilection for Jerome.

Writing to Beatus Rhenanus in June 1520, Zwingli omits any direct reference to Augustine in his references to patristic writers.[32] It is, in fact, extremely difficult to establish the extent and nature of Zwingli's use of Augustine prior to moving to Zurich in 1519.[33] Thus, for example, the most important marginal glosses to Zwingli's Augustine editions are to be found in the Amerbach edition – yet it is not clear precisely when Zwingli came into possession of this edition, let alone whether the marginal comments were entered at Einsiedeln or Zurich. In practice, most of these marginal comments must be recognized as dating from the Zurich period, if they can be dated at all, and chiefly to concern sacramental theology. There is also a conspicuous absence of any reference to Augustine in the celebrated letter to Myconius of July 24, 1520, which is often regarded as marking Zwingli's break with humanism.[34] This absence suggests that Zwingli did not regard his break with humanism as resulting from any direct influence of Augustine. The evidence that some (particularly Köhler) have suggested indicates a prolonged engagement with the thought of Augustine since 1516 is both circumstantial and ambiguous,[35] and is insufficient to permit any conclusions of substance to be drawn. Rather, Zwingli appears to have used the patristic testimony initially in a characteristically humanist fashion, and to have been drawn to Augustine in the Zurich period more for his sacramental views than for his theology of grace – an area of theology which, the reader is reminded, never possessed the same importance for Zwingli as it did for Luther or Karlstadt.

This initial lack of interest in Augustine's theology of grace within the Reformed constituency gave way to increasing concern with the anti-Pelagian corpus in the 1530s and 1540s. While Calvin's sometime colleague Pierre Viret was markedly ambivalent concerning the merits of the *testimonia patrum*, there is little doubt concerning the identity of the predominant patristic writer. Augustine is clearly regarded as preeminent among the fathers.[36] By the time of Calvin, the supreme authority of Augustine had been firmly established. Thus Calvin clearly understood the Reformation to be a restoration or recapitulation of the theology of Augustine, occasionally suggesting that everything he himself had written might be regarded as a paraphrase of Augustine's writings.[37] In this, he is clearly in agreement with the Wittenberg *vera theologia* – but it is not clear that this point alone explains Calvin's high estimate of Augustine. The suggestion that Calvin's conversion is itself due to Augustine[38] – thus explaining the high regard entertained for the latter by the former

– is ingenious, but lacks documentation. While the possibility that the origins of Calvin's distinctive ideas may lie with a close reading of Augustine is not to be totally rejected out of hand, the fact that Calvin belongs to the second generation of Reformers must serve as a reminder that we are dealing increasingly with the *mediated* influence of the patristic testimony, through the medium of the Reformation itself. Whereas the late medieval period based its theology upon a tradition-encapsulated Augustine, the later Reformation increasingly developed its own tradition concerning the great African theologian.[39]

The patristic testimony must therefore be regarded as having an ultimately indeterminable, but probably slight, influence upon the intellectual origins of the Reformed church. It is probably true to say that the fathers influenced Zwingli to much the same extent as they influenced Erasmus – as exegetical, moral, and spiritual, but not primarily *doctrinal* guides. There is no substantial evidence to indicate that the intellectual origins of the Reformed evangelical faction are to be explained even partly upon the basis of a direct rediscovery of Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings, whereas there are excellent reasons for suggesting that such a "rediscovery" underlay the origins of the Wittenberg theology of 1517–19, particularly as developed by Karlstadt.

However, it must be observed that the early Reformed church in the period 1515–20 displayed nothing that even approached the Wittenberg preoccupation with the doctrine of grace at the same time and that lay behind their wrestling with the anti-Pelagian Augustinian corpus. The sharply different theological concerns of the early Lutheran and Reformed evangelical movements go some way toward accounting for their different evaluation and reception of Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings. The Reformation may indeed have been a "rediscovery" of Augustine – but the Augustines whom the Wittenberg and Zurich theologians rediscovered were rather different – as will become clear presently as we consider Luther's strongly Augustinian conception of a reforming theology.

The Patristic Testimony and the Origins of the Lutheran Church

The influence of Augustine upon Luther at every stage of his theological development is undeniable.[40] Thus in his critique of the Aristotelian

concept of the created habit, Luther makes a direct appeal to Augustine's doctrine of the union of the believer with God through the Holy Spirit.[41] Similarly, Luther's growing awareness of the impotence of the human *liberum arbitrium*, explicitly incorporated into his theology of justification by 1515–16,[42] appears to be based upon a close reading of Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings. Nevertheless, perhaps Luther's most important statement concerning his theological development – the autobiographical fragment of 1545 – indicates that Augustine is implicated in an essentially peripheral manner in relation to this development.[43] According to Luther, his crucial reflections on the nature of "the righteousness of God" (*iustitia Dei*) were essentially complete *before* he encountered a similar interpretation of the concept in Augustine's *De spiritu et litera*. It is, of course, possible that Luther may be defensively minimizing his debt to Augustine in order to strengthen his own claim to theological originality or independence. Luther first begins to cite *De spiritu et litera* in late 1515, by which time his theological breakthrough had almost certainly taken place.[44] It is also clear that the concept of *iustitia Dei* that Luther "discovered" is quite distinct from that of Augustine.[45]

While Luther and Augustine concur in the view that *iustitia Dei* is a righteousness *given by*, rather than *belonging to*, God, Luther develops two major aspects of this righteousness that have no parallel in Augustine. First, this righteousness is revealed in the cross of Christ; second, this righteousness contradicts human expectations and preconceptions of the form it should take.[46] A detailed comparison of Luther and Augustine in relation to their doctrines of justification indicates a common anti-Pelagian theology of grace, along with points of significance at which Luther and Augustine diverge radically,[47] making it impossible to argue that Luther merely reproduced Augustine's soteriology, or altered its emphasis slightly. Although Luther may – in common with many late medieval theologians – retain an Augustinian soteriological *framework*, the novel elements of his reforming theology appear to originate elsewhere.

The basis of Luther's appeal to the patristic testimony is set out with particular clarity in his 1539 treatise "Von den Konziliis und Kirchen."[48] It must be stressed that Luther does not regard his attribution of a significant degree of theological authority to patristic writers, especially Augustine, to be inconsistent with, or even in tension with, his emphasis on the *sola scriptura* principle. Scripture and the patristic testimony

belong together as a source and its stream, with the latter pointing back to the former.[49]

Luther's Wittenberg colleague Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt also had a high regard for Augustine; nevertheless, he and Luther interpreted him in very different manners, and initially came to very different conclusions concerning some works traditionally attributed to Augustine. Using the anti-Pelagian corpus as a criterion, Luther recognized by 1516 that the highly influential treatise *de vera et falsa poenitentia* was pseudo-Augustinian. This conclusion had not been drawn by the editors of any of the editions of the *Opera Augustini* that Luther had used up to this point. Thus the 1489 Strasbourg edition of the *Opuscula Augustini*, consulted by Luther in 1509, included the work as authentic,[50] as did the authoritative Amerbach edition.[51] In a disputation of September 25, 1516, alluded to earlier (pp. 59–60), Luther outraged Karlstadt through his suggestion that the treatise was not Augustinian.[52] In that Luther had also suggested that Augustine did not countenance the view that humanity could fulfill the commandments of God through its own abilities,[53] the scene was clearly set for a significant confrontation within the Wittenberg theological faculty over the precise characteristics of Augustine's doctrine of grace. Karlstadt's purchase of an edition of Augustine on January 13, 1517 appears to have convinced him that Luther was right (at least, on these points of interpretation), with the result that on April 26 of the same year he publicly defended 151 theses drawn from the works of Augustine (particularly *de spiritu et litera*), before delivering a pioneering lecture course on this same anti-Pelagian work during the academic year 1517–18.

It is clear from the text of this lecture course that Karlstadt's theology of grace is thoroughly Augustinian, exhibiting none of the radical points of departure so characteristic of Luther by this stage. Thus Karlstadt interprets *iustitia Dei* in throroughly Augustinian terms (avoiding any notion of an externally imputed, as opposed to intrinsically present, righteousness),[54] develops a dialectic between law and *grace* rather than law and *gospel* (as with Luther), and emphasizes the priority of *grace* in justification rather than of *faith*.[55] Luther's views on the radical dichotomy between divine and human righteousness is conspicuously absent, as is the Christological (more accurately, staurological) concentration so characteristic of Luther's theological deliberations at this point.

From this point onward, the Wittenberg theological faculty appears to have moved toward adopting a reforming theology based upon "the

Bible and Augustine,"[56] embodying the essence of Augustine's anti-Pelagian theology. The publication on February 6, 1517 of Staupitz's *Libellus de exsecutione aeternae praedestinationis*, which developed a radical doctrine of double predestination similar to that of the *schola Augustiniana moderna*,[57] unquestionably served to strengthen the hand of those at Wittenberg who wished to treat Augustine as *summus theologus*: it also served to call into question the Augustinian provenance of the medieval theological axiom *si non es praedestinatus fac ut praedestineris*[58] (a loose translation of which might be "if you aren't predestined yet, go and make yourself predestined"), thus facilitating the task of defending their radical interpretation of Augustine's theology of grace to those, such as Eck, who preferred to read their Augustine through the mirror of tradition.

This program of reform through a return to the primary theological sources of the patristic period clearly captured the imagination of Philip Melanchthon, who joined the Wittenberg faculty as professor of Greek in 1518.[59] For Melanchthon, there was no conflict between the principle of the supreme authority of Scripture and that of the positive theological evaluation of the witness of the early church. The fathers were to be valued primarily as early exponents of Scripture.[60] Of particular interest is Melanchthon's justification for the emphasis placed by the Wittenberg Reformers upon the views of Augustine. According to Melanchthon, the period of the early church in the first four centuries was characterized by a gradual defection from the *primum et verum*, the "authentic" gospel.[61] This process was particularly associated with Origen, whose allegorizing method proved seriously misleading to his readers, distracting them from the true (literal) meaning of the scriptural text.[62] According to Melanchthon, the situation was redressed through the influence of Augustine, who Melanchthon treats as embodying the primitive gospel, with its Origenistic corruptions eliminated.[63] The identification of Augustine as the criterion of theological orthodoxy led Melanchthon to argue that he served as a model for all subsequent reformations of the church. In this respect, the Wittenberg Reformation was simply the application to the sixteenth century situation of the principles of the "Augustinian Reformation" of the early fifth century.

Although the influence of Augustine upon the personal theological development of the young Luther may have been less than decisive, the evidence suggests that his influence over the Wittenberg Reformation

as a whole was pivotal. Karlstadt's conversion to the evangelical cause in 1517 effectively established the dominance of Augustine over the corporate reforming theology associated with the Wittenberg theological faculty, so that the *vera theologia* was essentially Scripture as interpreted in the anti-Pelagian writings of Augustine. This point should be borne in mind when attempting to evaluate the possible influence of the *schola Augustiniana moderna* over this movement: in that both movements appealed to Scripture and the anti-Pelagian *corpus*, a certain degree of theological convergence would be expected, and cannot be assumed necessarily to reflect the direct textual influence of the *schola Augustiniana moderna* over the Wittenberg Reformation.

The manner in which the Reformers exploited the *testimonia patrum* illustrates one of the many difficulties attending any attempt to establish the precise relationship between the Renaissance and the Reformation. In many respects, the reforming educational program developed by the Wittenberg theological faculty parallels that favored by the humanists – the return to the study of original sources (such as the Bible and the fathers), the study of the three sacred languages (Hebrew, Greek, and Latin), and the elimination from the curriculum of works of "scholastic" theology.[64] This indicates the necessity to distinguish the *substance* of the theological method of the early Reformation from its *underlying motivation*. It is not enough merely to consider *what* theological sources and methods the Reformers adopted: the reasons *why* they adopted them must be established, if those aspects of the Reformation that serve to distinguish it from the Renaissance are to be identified. In the case of the Wittenberg Reformation, the study of the Bible (including the associated necessary philological and textual techniques) was undertaken in an attempt to recapture the Word of God, in order that the church might be reformed upon its basis, both as an institution in itself and in relation to its doctrine. The study of the fathers was regarded as a valuable ancillary tool toward this end, and as justifying the emphasis upon Augustine within the patristic corpus on the basis of an explicitly acknowledged *doctrinal* criterion.[65]

Although this distinction may be maintained with relative ease with regard to the Wittenberg Reformation, it encounters serious difficulties in the case of Zwingli and the early Zurich Reformation. Zwingli does not appear to have studied the Bible, biblical languages, or the fathers with the same underlying presuppositions as those that governed contemporary developments at Wittenberg. The early Reformed church

shows considerably greater affinity with the Renaissance than its Wittenberg counterpart, both in terms of the substance of its theological method, and its underlying motivation. Although this situation would be altered, initially through Bullinger's reworking of Zwingli's theology,[66] and subsequently through the rise of Geneva as the political and theological center of the Reformed church,[67] the fact remains that the intellectual *origins* of the Reformed church are considerably more closely linked with the Renaissance than are their Lutheran equivalents. The bifurcation in theological methodology that we have noted in earlier chapters is thus confirmed by our analysis of the first phase of the Reformation in Wittenberg and Zurich, even if it is argued – rightly, I believe – that patristic concerns were neither instrumental nor decisive in precipitating the Reformation. The divergence of the early Reformed and Lutheran attitudes to the *testimonia patrum* confirms a more general pattern of intellectual attitudes, which point to the fundamentally distinct theological methodologies adopted at Zurich and Wittenberg, rendering any notion that the movement was theologically homogeneous in its first and critical phase intensely problematic.

At this point, our detailed analysis of the specifics of the origins of the theological methods of the first phase of the Reformation must come to a close. Having examined some major issues of intellectual history in considerable detail, we must now identify the general conclusions that result from such an analysis.

Conclusion: The Intellectual Heterogeneity of the Early Reformation

The present study is essentially an essay in the history of ideas, which has demonstrated the unequivocal intellectual continuity between the ideas and methods of late scholasticism, the Renaissance, and the first phase of the Reformation. Apart from documenting and clarifying the obvious continuities between the Reformation and its context, the most fundamental conclusion of this study is the need to concede the complexity and heterogeneity of the origins of the ideas underlying the Reformation. Any attempt to adopt a reductionist approach to this remarkable historical phenomenon – whether by ignoring its theological dimension altogether or by imposing a preconceived interpretative framework upon obviously recalcitrant material – can only result in a misapprehension of its nature and significance. The movement so loosely designated "the Reformation" arose from a complex heterogeneous matrix of social and ideological factors, the latter associated with individual personalities, intellectual movements, schools of thought, and universities in such a manner as to defy the crass generalizations that are the substance of all too many interpretations of the phenomenon.

In terms of the history of ideas, the Reformation is best conceived as a series of initially essentially independent reforming movements,[1] with quite distinct agendas and understandings of both how theology was to be done, and what its role might be within the life of the church. Through the complex networks of the interchange of persons, correspondence, and publications that were characteristic of the age, these movements came to achieve at least a partial degree of alignment over the following years. Protestant apologists understandably prefer to concentrate on these alignments, not least because it facilitates the portrayal

of the Reformation as an essentially united movement. Yet the origins of the movement are local rather than global, reflecting local circumstances – including the agendas of individual thinkers, the constitution and local status of humanist sodalities, the relative strengths of humanism and scholasticism (and the form of scholasticism that was dominant) at local universities, the local agendas of city councils, the availability of books in local libraries, and the social and political concerns of the region. The cantonal structure of Switzerland at this historical juncture accentuated and institutionalized such regional variations, while at the same time making reform a genuine local possibility.[2] As many of these issues must be regarded as belonging to the general area of "social history," it will immediately be clear that it is impossible to maintain an absolute distinction between intellectual history and social history. The "available believable" – to borrow a nuanced phrase from Paul Ricouer – is inevitably determined by the social location of the individual thinker. While the late Renaissance saw significant developments toward the emergence of a pan-European scholarly culture, there were still substantial local variations in existence at the dawn of the sixteenth century. A thinker's geographical location was of major significant in relation to the available intellectual resources and theological options, and the ease with which any reforming program might be put into operation.

The quest for the intellectual origins of the Reformation thus concerns not the identification of a single factor, nor even a group of factors, that may be said to have *caused* the movement, but rather concerns the unfolding of a complex matrix of creatively interacting intellectual currents, whose precise mode of interaction was determined as much by local as by cosmopolitan, by social as by academic, factors. Intellectual currents that interacted creatively in one locality did not do so elsewhere; indeed, they might not even be present at certain locations that would prove to be significant to the genesis of certain local reforming movements.Considered from the standpoint of the history of ideas, the genesis of the Reformation was intellectually heterogeneous. The theological methods developed and deployed at Wittenberg and Zurich in the first phase of the Reformation were quite distinct, reflecting the different social locations of their leading thinkers, and the divergent understandings of theological methodology that they espoused.

The heterogeneity of the Reformation is best seen by considering the relation of its elements to scholasticism and humanism. In the case of both, serious difficulties of definition must be noted. A simplistic

identification of "scholasticism" with a degenerate Ockhamism, or "humanism" with the personal preoccupations and predispositions of Erasmus of Rotterdam, has enormously hindered the proper evaluation of the relation of these movements to the Reformation. As was emphasized earlier, a careful study of the nature of both these movements is an essential prerequisite of modern Reformation historiography. It is for this reason that the recent clarification of the characteristics of both the *via moderna* and the *schola Augustiniana moderna*, and the pioneering studies of Kristeller on the nature of Renaissance humanism, are of such seminal importance to contemporary Reformation scholarship. The invalidation of many of the older studies of the relationship of the Reformation in general, or individual elements or personalities within it, to scholasticism and humanism is ultimately a consequence of our growing understanding of these latter movements.

In the light of these developments, it is clear that the Wittenberg Reformation was characterized by a direct engagement with scholasticism. Although both Luther and Karlstadt were unquestionably aided in this matter by the newly developed humanist textual and philological techniques, it seems that Luther employed the hermeneutics of the late medieval period in his biblical exegesis, during the course of which he gradually broke free from the soteriological framework of the *via moderna*. In other words, Luther's theological breakthrough must be regarded as a development *within*, rather than a radical break with, the framework of late medieval thought. Although it was once fashionable to speak of "Luther's Copernican Revolution," which substituted a theocentricity for the medieval anthropocentricity, the suggestion of such a radical discontinuity (implicit in the use of the term "revolution") simply cannot be sustained. The "theocentricity" in question was characteristic of the *schola Augustiniana moderna* in the later medieval period, with which Luther was indirectly familiar, and with which he certainly exhibits at least some degree of theological continuity and affinity. Far from breaking with the medieval theological tradition, Luther may be regarded merely as adopting a somewhat different position within its broad compass. The "desk-bound" character of Luther's theology during the period 1513–19 has often been noted, reflecting the fact that at this point it was an academic, rather than a popular, reforming theology, directed primarily against academic opponents.

The scholastic character of the early Wittenberg Reformation serves to highlight the divergence from the Reformed church at this point.

The strongly Erasmian character of Zwingli's theology in the period 1515–20 illustrates the humanist character of the early Reformed theology. The direct engagement with scholasticism, so prominent a feature of the Wittenberg Reformation, is here conspicuous by its absence. Where Luther criticized the scholastics in order to refute them, Zwingli criticized them in order to bypass them altogether, in characteristic Erasmian style. The vitality of the early Reformed theology – which contrasts with the somewhat dull and stolid Wittenberg theology of the same period, 1515–20 – reflects the humanist conviction that religion concerns life in all its fullness, rather than theological formulations. Thus the very different environments in which the Wittenberg and Zurich reforming theologies emerged must be emphasized: the former was initially an academic, the latter a social and ecclesiastical, reforming movement. Although the impact of the new philological, textual, and exegetical techniques was unquestionably felt at Wittenberg, the appropriation and exploitation of these techniques is particularly to be associated with the early period of the Reformed church. Whereas these techniques were employed to a limited extent at Wittenberg to develop a reformed academic Augustinianism, at Zurich they were exploited to forge a theology by which both city and church might be reformed.

The present study has been particularly concerned with the question of the intellectual origins of the Reformation. The intricacy of the discussion of this question in earlier sections of this work may inhibit identification of the broad features of the late medieval intellectual landscape against which these developments took place. It may therefore be helpful if these main developments are identified, in order to set the points of detail in a broader context.

The inherent doctrinal diversity of the late medieval period must be noted. The later Middle Ages, particularly the fifteenth century, was characterized by a theological pluralism arising from factors such as the rise of the different methodologies associated with the various theological schools. There was thus a spectrum of theological opinions within the late medieval church, raising the question of the relation of these "opinions" to catholic dogma. Since the late medieval period witnessed a crisis of authority within the church, there was growing confusion, particularly evident during the fifteenth century, concerning what was merely "theological opinion" and what was actually "catholic dogma." This inevitably led to the former being confused with the

latter. The necessity of toleration in respect of divergent theological opinions was vigorously defended during the period as an essential aspect of constructive academic theological debate, and such "opinions" were often recognized as possessing a purely heuristic, and hence provisional, validity. Nevertheless, in a period that witnessed an unprecedented proliferation of such "opinions," authoritative pronouncements concerning the relation of "opinions" to "dogma" were conspicuously absent.

The teaching authority of the *magisterium* had been seriously weakened through the obvious difficulties raised for such a concept of authority by the Great Schism, with the result that, in the absence of any magisterial guidance, theological opinions became confused with catholic dogma. As we noted, there are excellent reasons for suggesting that Martin Luther's views concerning the alleged "Pelagianism" of the medieval church may well have arisen from his confusing the theological positions of the *via moderna* with the official teaching of the church. Accompanying this erosion of the teaching authority of the church was an apparent disinclination (whether through unwillingness or inability) on the part of the *magisterium* to take decisive forcible action to suppress opinions of which it disapproved. This development had its roots in the fifteenth century, but is most evident in the third decade of the sixteenth century. Thus the German diocesan and provincial synods, traditionally the enforcers of religious orthodoxy, do not appear to have been convened during the crucial years 1522–3, when the forcible suppression of the ideas of the Reformers was a real possibility.

A further point of importance concerns the perceived nature of theology in the later medieval period. There was a general tendency (with certain exceptions within the Franciscan Order) to regard theology as essentially the exposition of Scripture. This understanding of the nature of theology inevitably entailed a crisis in the wake of the rise of the new philological, literary, and exegetical techniques of the Renaissance, in that "Scripture" could no longer be equated with "the Vulgate text, as traditionally received." The possibility that the content of Christian theology might be significantly altered through the impact of the new learning could not be excluded. To many catholics, "sacred philology" seemed to undermine certain traditional catholic teachings, particularly in relation to Mariology and the theology of penance – teachings that the Reformers were more than happy to dispense with, while retaining the idea of theology as the exposition of Scripture.

The root cause of this was a change in what the term *scriptura* was perceived to entail. In the Middle Ages, the term designated the Vulgate text of Scripture. It was known, at least in some circles, that there were awkward questions that might be raised concerning the reliability of the *textus Vulgatus*, both as a translation and as a textual entity. These, however, were generally not pursued. With the rise of the Renaissance came a growing demand for textual integrity, and for a direct engagement with classical texts in their original languages. The Vulgate proved vulnerable on both counts. Although Erasmus's *Novum Instrumentum omne* (1516) was seriously deficient in many respects, it nevertheless marked the public recognition that the Vulgate could no longer be regarded as *scriptura*. The theological implications of this recognition would resonate throughout western Christendom, especially within the humanist sodalities. Zwingli, for example, developed his reforming theology through an engagement with Erasmus's Greek text – which a colleague reported he had learned by heart – using the hermeneutical techniques favored and espoused by Erasmus and his circle.

Yet the broad features of Luther's reforming theology were already in place before Erasmus's work was published in 1516, and seem to owe nothing substantive to the humanist's intellectual endeavors. Luther's theological breakthrough was like a planet orbiting a different methodological sun. Luther may have had access to the Hebrew text of five Psalms – thanks to the editorial work of Jacques Lefèvre d'Etaples – but his theological breakthrough took place through an engagement with the *Vulgate* text using a *scholastic* hermeneutical scheme.

The heterogeneity of the theological methods underlying the Reformation gave rise to a corresponding divergence in relation to its theological ideas. The most obvious example of this is the fundamental divergence between the Wittenberg and Zurich reformations over the doctrine of justification by faith. There is no doubt that Luther regarded this theological issue to be central to his reforming program, and developed a series of related notions (such as the doctrine of the *iustitia Christi aliena*) which became definitive for the later phase of the movement. However, it is quite clear that this concern was not shared by the early theologians of the southern German and Swiss Reformation. The theologians of this movement – such as Zwingli and Bucer – initially demonstrated a near-total disinterest in the doctrine, and subsequently appear to have misunderstood it, regarding it as detrimental to the development of piety. The independence of the origins

of the Swiss Reformation from its Wittenberg counterpart is of considerable significance in this context, lending weight to the suggestion that the concerns of the two movements were different. The Reformed church, from its first phase onwards, demonstrated a concern (whether it may be designated as "humanist" or not) to reform the morals and practices of the church on the basis of Scripture, without in any way linking this development of the principle *sola scriptura* with that of justification *sola fide*. The suggestion that the principle of justification *sola fide* was the universal cause of the Reformation is quite unjustified. It was but one of a number of elements in a complex movement. The disunity within the movement, which was publicly highlighted by the failure of the Colloquy of Marburg (1529), had been present from the beginnings of the Reformation, being implicit in the movement's multiple methodologies.

Part of the theological agenda of the second phase of the Reformation was the consolidation of the potentially divergent agendas of Luther and Zwingli. This process was assisted partly by the eclipse of Zurich as a theological center, and the failure of Zwingli's successors to institutionalize his theological agendas. The shift in power, both political and intellectual, from Zurich to Berne, and then from Berne to Geneva, allowed a certain distance to be placed between the theological agenda of Zwingli and Calvin,[3] with the latter building significant theological bridges between the two wings of the Reformation. The documentation of the gradual marginalization of Zwingli's theological legacy within Reformed theology lies beyond the scope of this study; our concern is simply to note the problems bequeathed to later interpreters and apologists of the Reformation by its intellectually heterogenous origins.

Finally, let us ask an unanswerable question. Was the Reformation an inevitability? This survey of the intellectual currents on the eve of the Reformation indicates that some form of upheaval within contemporary catholicism was highly probable. The factors that have been documented in the present study suggest that a significant degree of doctrinal instability had developed within catholicism by the end of the first decade of the sixteenth century, with little immediate prospect of its resolution. The development of such instability would have important consequences for the self-understanding of the church at this point. This, however, need point to no more than a shift in attitudes within contemporary catholicism, rather than the development of schism within it. The Reformation, considered as a historical phenomenon, cannot

be explained on the basis of the religious ideas underlying it alone. The rise of nationalism, the growing political power of both the south German and Swiss cities and the German princes, the rise in lay piety and theological awareness – all these coincided with this crisis within the world of religious ideas, turning an essentially intellectual movement into a political upheaval. It was this combination of social, political, and religious parameters that must be regarded as underlying the specific historical form which the Reformation took. The quest for the intellectual origins of the European Reformation is an essential aspect of the study of that movement – but it cannot claim to define the specific historical form that the movement adopted. There was unquestionably an irreducible religious and intellectual element to the Reformation, which contributed significantly to its shaping – but it was not the only such element. The historian of ideas must become a social historian to come to terms with the full complexity of this fascinating movement in the flux of human history – just as the social historian must also become a historian of ideas.

The quest for the intellectual origins of the Reformation will, on account of its inherent complexity, continue to exercise a fascination over the historian of ideas for some considerable time to come. Indeed, it is quite possible that future research will demonstrate still more clearly how complex and heterogeneous the Reformation was as an intellectual phenomenon. Just as the simplifications of yesteryear, although congenial to the purposes of historians and popular accounts of the origins of the Reformation, have been called into question by the intensive research of the past quarter of a century, it must be recognized that even the tentative conclusions of today may be invalidated through future intensification of the quest for the intellectual origins of the Reformation. Nevertheless, it is hoped that the present study will at least indicate the current state of knowledge on the question, and perhaps stimulate others to undertake further work in what is perhaps one of the most intriguing areas of academic research.

Notes

Preface

1 See, for example, Geoffrey Cantor, "The Reception of the Wave Theory of Light in Britain: A Case Study Illustrating the Role of Methodology in Scientific Debate," *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences* 6 (1975), 109–32; Alvar Ellegård, *Darwin and the General Reader: The Reception of Darwin's Theory of Evolution in the British Periodical Press, 1859–1872* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1990); Victor Navarro Brotóns, "The Reception of Copernicus in Sixteenth-Century Spain: The Case of Diego de Zúñiga," *Isis* 86 (1995), 52–78.

2 The reflections of the Constance School of Reception Aesthetics are of particular interest here: see the extensive literature responding to Heinrich Anz, "Erwartungshorizont: Ein Diskussionsbeitrag zu H. R. Jauß Begründung einer Rezeptionsästhetik der Literatur," *Euphorion* 70 (1970), 398–408; Stefanie Hüttinger, *Der Tod der Mimesis als Ontologie und ihre Verlagerung zur mimetischen Rezeption: Eine mimetische Rezeptionsästhetik als postmoderner Ariadnefaden* (Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, 1994).

3 Eckhard Bernstein, "From Outsiders to Insiders: Some Reflections on the Development of a Group Identity of the German Humanists between 1450 and 1530," in C. G. Nauert and J. V. Mehl (eds.), *In laudem Caroli: Renaissance and Reformation studies for Charles G. Nauert* (Sixteenth Century Publishers, Kirksville, MO, 1998), 45–64.

Introduction

1 For comment, see Carter Lindberg, *The European Reformations* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1996).

2 G. V. Plekhanov, *Fundamental Problems of Marxism* (International Publishers, New York, 1969), p. 80. On this writer, see Samuel H. Baron, *Plekhanov: The Father of Russian Marxism* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1963).

3 See here Roy Bhaskar, *The Possibility of Naturalism: A Philosophical Critique of the Contemporary Human Sciences* (London, Routledge, 1998).

4 For an excellent survey of the development of social approaches to the Reformation from Marx onwards, see A. G. Dickens and John M. Tonkin, *The Reformation in Historical Thought* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1985), pp. 234–321.

5 See Max Steinmetz, "Probleme der frühbürgerlichen Revolution in Deutschland in der ersten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhundert," in Gerhard Brendler (ed.), *Die frühbürgerlichen Revolution in Deutschland* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1961), pp. 17–52, especially p. 32; Berndt Moeller, "Probleme der Reformationsgeschichtsforschung," *ZKG* 76 (1965), 246–57.

6 Robert I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Power and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1990).

7 See, e.g., Erich Hassinger, *Das Werden des neuzeitlichen Europa 1300–1600* (Westermann, Braunschweig, 2nd edn., 1966); Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine. 4. Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300–1700)* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago/London, 1984).

8 This point is brought out by Heiko A. Oberman, "Reformation: Epoche oder Episode," *ARG* 68 (1977), 56–111, especially pp. 56–64, where he draws attention to the influence of the interests of defining groups upon the definition of epochs. See further Paul Ourliac and Henri Gilles, *La période post-classique, 1378–1500: la problématique de l'époque* (Cujas, Paris, 1971); Franklin H. Littell, "The Periodization of History", in F. Forrester (ed.), *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History* (Brill, Leiden,1979), 18–30.

9 Oberman, "Reformation: Epoche oder Episode," pp. 74–88.

10 See, e.g., Abraham Friesen, *Reformation and Utopia: The Marxist Interpretation of the Reformalion and its Antecedents* (Franz Steiner, Wiesbaden, 1974), especially pp. 189–205; Thomas Nipperdey, "Die Reformation als Problem der marxistischen Geschichtswissenschaft," in *Reformation, Revolution, Utopie: Studien zum 16. Jahrhundert* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1975), pp. 9–34. Interestingly, on the basis of this understanding of the significance of the Reformation, it still proves possible to treat Huss as a "Forerunner of the Reformation": see Robert Kalivoda, *Revolution und Ideologie: Der Hussitismus* (Herder, Cologne/Vienna, 1976), especially p. 254.

11 For example, see Josef Engel, *Die Entstehung des neuzeitlichen Europa* (Union Verlag, Stuttgart, 1971), pp. 1–43.

12 For the dynamics of the development of Reformed communities and their distinctive ideas, see G. W. Locher, "Von Bern nach Genf: Die Ursachen der Spannung zwischen zwinglischer und calvinistischer Reformation," in W. Balke, C. Graafland, and H. Harkema (eds.), *Wegen en Gestalten in het Gereformeerd Protestantisme* (Ton Bolland, Amsterdam, 1976), pp. 75–87.

13 For the impact of these tensions on church, society, and universities, see Thomas Kaufmann, *Universität und lutherische Konfessionalisierung: Die Rostocker Theologieprofessoren und ihr Beitrag zur theologischen Bildung und kirchlichen Gestaltung im Herzogtum Mecklenburg zwischen 1550 und 1675* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Gütersloh, 1997); Heiko E. Janssen, *Gräfin Anna von Ostfriesland: Eine hochadelige Frau der späten Reformationszeit (1540/42–1575). Ein Beitrag zu den Anfängen der reformierten Konfessionalisierung im Reich* (Aschendorff, Münster, 1998).

14 Martin Friedrich, *Von Marburg bis Leuenberg: Der lutherisch-reformierte Gegensatz und seine Überwindung* (Spenner, Waltrup, 1999). For the texts, see Friedrich W. Schirrmacher, *Briefe und Acten zu der Geschichte des Religionsgespräches zu Marburg 1529 und des Reichstages zu Augsburg 1530* (Perthes, Gotha, 1876).

15 For a perceptive introduction to the terms, see Josef Bohatec, "'Lutherisch' und 'Reformiert'," *Reformiertes Kirchenblatt für Österreich* (28 January, 1951), pp. 1–3.
16 Thus they are more accurately referred to as "Evangelical-Lutheran" and "Evangelical-Reformed," See Bohatec, "'Lutherisch' und 'Reformiert'," p. 2.
17 Bodo Nischan, *Lutherans and Calvinists in the Age of Confessionalism* (Ashgate, Aldershot, 1999).
18 For example, his *Farrago confusanearum et inter se dissidentium opinionum de coena Domini ex sacramentariorum libris congesta* (Magdeburg, 1552). See Ernst Bizer, *Studien zur Geschichte des Abendmahlstreits im 16. Jahrhundert* (Gerd Mohn, Gütersloh, 1940); Jean Cadier, *La doctrine calviniste de la sainte cène* (Faculté de théologie protestante de Montpellier, Montpellier, 1951).
19 See further Hans Leube, *Kalvinismus und Luthertum im Zeitalter der Orthodoxie I: Der Kampf um die Herrschaft im protestantischen Deutschland* (Deichert, Leipzig, 1928).
20 For its terms, see C. W. Spieker, *Geschichte des Augsburger Religionsfriedens von 26. Sepember 1555* (Schleiz, 1854); Karl Brandi, *Der Augsburger Religionsfriede von 25. September 1555* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1927).
21 See the dedicatory epistle to the Jeremiah commentary, dated 23 July 1563, *CR* (Calvin) 20.73, "*Dum ergo Calvinismum obiciendo aliqua infamiae nota tua, Celsitudinem aspergere conantur, nihil aliud quam suam privitatem cum stultitia frustra et magno suo cum dedecore produnt.*"

Chapter 1 The Shape of Late Medieval Religious Thought

1 See, e.g., Armand Maurer, *Medieval Philosophy* (Random House, New York, 1962), p. 265; Gordon Leff, *The Dissolution of the Medieval Outlook: An Essay on Intellectual and Spiritual Change in the Fourteenth Century* (New York University Press, New York, 1976).
2 Heiko A. Oberman, "Fourteenth Century Religious Thought: A Premature Profile," *Speculum* 53 (1978), 80–93.
3 On Germany, see G. Ritter, "Why the Reformation Occurred in Germany," *Church History* 27 (1958), 99–106; Berndt Moeller, "Frömmigkeit in Deutschland um 1500," *ARG* 61 (1965), 5–31; Karl Schlemmer, "Gottesdienst und Frömmigkeit in Nürnberg vor der Reformation," *Zeitschrift für bayerische Kirchengeschichte* 44 (1975), 1–27. On England, see C. Haigh, "Some Aspects of Recent Historiography of the English Reformation," in W. J. Mommsen (ed.), *The Urban Classes, the Nobility and the Reformation* (Publications of the German Historical Institute, London, 1980), pp. 88–106.
4 R. Crofts, "Books, Reform and the Reformation," *ARG* 71 (1980), 21–35; J. J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1985), pp. 1–39.
5 Hans-Peter Geh, *Mittelalterliche Andachtsbücher: Psalterien, Stundenbücher, Gebetbücher. Zeugnisse europäischer Frömmigkeit* (Badische Landesbibliothek, Karlsruhe, 1992).
6 For examples of the impact of this phenomenon on late medieval city life, see N. Birnbaum, "The Zwinglian Reformation in Zürich," *Past and Present* 15 (1959), 27–47; R. M. Kingdom, "Was the Protestant Reformation a Revolution?" in

R. M. Kingdom (ed.), *Transition and Revolution: Problems of European Renaissance and Reformation History* (Burgess, Minneapolis, 1974), pp. 53–107; R. W. Scribner, "Civic Unity and the Reformation in Erfurt," *Past and Present* (1975), 29–60; Steven E. Ozment, *The Reformation in the Cities: The Appeal of Protestantism to Sixteenth-Century Germany and Switzerland* (Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 1975). Ozment's psychological and social account of the origins and success of the Reformation is open to serious criticism: see Thomas A. Brady, *Ruling Class, Regime and Reformation at Strasbourg* (Brill, Leiden, 1978), pp. 9–10. For a careful and well-documented study of the discontent evident in popular German thought between c.1438 and 1519, see Gerald Strauss, *Manifestations of Discontent in Germany on the Eve of the Reformation* (Indiana University Press, Bloomington, IN, 1971).

7 For a well-documented study of the social status and activities of the inferior clergy of the later Middle Ages, see Dietrich Kurze, "Der niedere Klerus in der sozialen Welt des späten Mittelalters," in Knut Schultz (ed.), *Beiträge zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte des Mittelalters* (Bohlau, Cologne/Vienna, 1976), pp. 273–305. This question is set in a broader context in the invaluable survey of Karl Trödinger, *Stadt und Kirche im spätmittelalterlichen Würzburg* (Klett-Cotta, Stuttgart, 1978). For a specific case study of relevance at this point, see Geoffrey Dipple, *Antifraternalism and Anticlericalism in the German Reformation: Johann Eberlin von Günzburg and the Campaign Against the Friars* (Ashgate, Aldershot, 1996).

8 Peter Kern, *Trinität, Maria, Inkarnation: Studien zur Thematik der deutschen Dichtung des späteren Mittelalters* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1971). It is also important to appreciate that the ability to read manuscript text became increasingly common among the laity in the fifteenth century: Paul Saenger, "Silent Reading: Its Impact on Late Medieval Script," *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 13 (1982), 367–414, especially pp. 408–13.

9 For the best study of this aspect of this order, see Kaspar Elm, "Die Bruderschaft von gemeinsamen Leben: Eine geistliche Lebensform zwischen Kloster und Welt, Mittelalter und Neuzeit," *Ons geestelijk Erf* 59 (1985), 470–96.

10 Hans N. Janowski, *Geert Groote, Thomas von Kempen und die Devotio Moderna* (Walter Verlag, Olten, 1978).

11 This point has been emphasized by R. R. Post, *The Modern Devotion: Confrontation with Reformation and Humanism* (Brill, Leiden, 1968), p. 97, against the earlier views of Albert Hyma, *The Devotio Moderna or Christian Renaissance (1380–1520)* (Baker, Grand Rapids, MI, 2nd edn, 1975). See further Hans Michael Franke, *Der Liber Ordinarius der Regularkanoniker der Windesheimer Kongregation* (Verlagshus Borengasser, Bonn, 1981).

12 James D. Tracy, *Erasmus: The Growth of a Mind* (Droz, Geneva, 1972), pp. 21–9.

13 Augustin Renaudet, *Préreforme et humanisme à Paris pendant les premières guerres d'Italie (1494–1517)* (Librairie d'Argences, Paris, 2nd edn, 1953), pp. 172–81. The possible link between the *devotio moderna* and Calvin through the Collège de Montaigu (which developed a strong association with the movement under Jan Standonck) should be noted at this point, although it is doubtful if the nature of this link will ever be fully clarified: August Renaudet, "Jean Standonck un réformateur avant la Réforme," *Humanisme et Renaissance, Travaux* 30 (1958),

114–61, and "L'humanisme et l'enseignement de l'université de Paris au temps de la Renaissance," in J. Calvet (ed.), *Aspects de l'Université de Paris* (Editions Albin Michel, Paris, 1949), pp. 135–55.

14 Heiko A. Oberman, *Werden und Wertung der Reformation: Vom Wegestreit zum Glaubenskampf* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1977), pp. 56–71.

15 Heiko A. Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought Illustrated by Key Documents* (Holt Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1981), pp. 7–9.

16 Denys Hay, *The Italian Renaissance* (Polity Press, Cambridge, UK, 2nd edn, 1977), pp. 49–57.

17 Marc Venard, "Pour une sociologie du clergé du XVIe siècle: recherches sur le recrutement sacédotal dans la province d'Avignon," *Annales Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 23 (1968), 987–1016.

18 Henry Heller, *The Conquest of Poverty: The Calvinist Revolt in Sixteenth-Century France* (Brill, Leiden, 1986), pp. 11–12, 53–4.

19 Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *Les paysans de Languedoc* (2 vols., Flammarion, Paris, 1966), vol. 1, pp. 320–6.

20 Théophile Boutiot, *Etudes historiques: recherches sur les anciennes pestes de Troyes* (Troyes, 1857), pp. 15–23; Alain Croix, *Nantes et pays nantais au XVIe siècle* (Editions France-Empire, Paris, 1974), pp. 109–10.

21 M. M. Edelstein, "Les origines sociales de l'épiscopat sous Louis XII et François I," *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* 24 (1977), 239–47.

22 L. E. Marcel, *Le Cardinal de Givry, évêque de Langres, 1529–1561* (2 vols., Dijon, 1926), vol. 1, pp. 69–109.

23 As Oberman notes, late medieval Germany was characterized by, if anything, an excess of piety: *Werden und Wertung der Reformation,* pp. 10–11. For comments on externalized forms of piety in England, see Susan S. Morrison, *Women Pilgrims in Late Medieval England: Private Piety as Public Performance* (Routledge, London, 2000); Mary C. Erler, *Women, Reading, and Piety in Late Medieval England* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2002); Kathleen Kamerick, *Popular Piety and Art in the Late Middle Ages: Image Worship and Idolatry in England, 1350–1500* (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2002).

24 The types of piety involved can be appreciated from works such as Konrad Eisenbichler, *Crossing the Boundaries: Christian Piety and the Arts in Italian Medieval and Renaissance Confraternities* (Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI, 1991); Andrew D. Brown, *Popular Piety in Late Medieval England: The Diocese of Salisbury, 1250–1550* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1995); G. J. C. Snoek, *Medieval Piety from Relics to the Eucharist* (Brill, Leiden, 1995).

25 For some examples, see Philip E. Webber, *A Late Medieval Devotional Anthology from Salzburg* (Kummerle, Göppingen, 1990). For more general reflections on the importance of this genre, see Anne Clark Bartlett and Thomas H. Bestul, *Cultures of Piety: Medieval English Devotional Literature in Translation* (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY, 1999). On the situation prior to the invention of printing, see D. L. D'Avray, *Medieval Marriage Sermons: Mass Communication in a Culture Without Print* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2001).

26 On the *Enchiridion*, see Robert Stupperich, "Das *Enchiridion Militis Christiani* des von Rotterdam nach seiner Entstehung, seinem Sinn und Charakter," *ARG* 69 (1978), 5–23. For English editions of the work, see Douglas H. Parker, *A Critical Edition of the English Enchiridion Militis Christiani of Erasmus, 1534* (University of Birmingham Press, Birmingham, 1971).

27 For Erasmus's comments upon the questions debated by the scholastic theologians see *Opera Omnia*, J. Leclerc (ed.), (Leiden, 1703–6), vol. 6, 926D–927B. Similar criticisms of the unintelligibility of the Latin of the scholastics were made by Melanchthon, *De corrigendis adolescentiae studiis; Werke*, H. Engelland and R. Nürnburger (eds.), (3 vols., Mohr, Tübingen, 1952–61), vol. 3, p. 45.

28 For details, see M. Consuelo Oldenbourg, *Hortulus animae (1494)–1523: Bibliographie und Illustration* (Hauswedell, Hamburg, 1973). For evaluation, see René Bornert, *La réforme Protestante du culte à Strasbourg au XVIe siècle (1523–1598)* (Brill, Leiden, 1981), pp. 25–8.

29 For an excellent general analysis, see Robert Stupperich, *Das Herforder Fraterhaus und die Devotio Moderna: Studien zur Frömmigkeitsgeschichte Westfalens an der Wende zur Neuzeit* (Aschendorff, Münster, 1975). On the situation in Germany and Bohemia, see Franz Machilek, "Die Frömmigkeit und die Krise des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts," *Medievalia Bohemica* 3 (1970), 209–27.

30 On which see J. Rivière, *Le probleme de l'église et de l'état au temps de Philippe le Bel* (Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, Louvain/Paris, 1926), pp. 79–91, 150–5, 394–404. It is possible to suggest that the claims to absolute temporal and spiritual power made by *Unam sanctam* may be traced back to Innocent III: see Brian Tierney, "'Tria quippe distinguit iudicia . . .' A Note on Innocent III's Decretal *Per venerabilem*," *Speculum* 37 (1962), 48–59. The suggestion that such views were foreshadowed in the works of the Franciscan Francis de Meyronnes has been successfully challenged: see F. Baethgen, "Dante und Franz von Mayronis," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschungen des Mittelalters* 15 (1959), 103–36.

31 Guillaume Mollat, *Les papes d'Avignon (1305–1378)* (Letouzey et Ane, Paris, 1965); Yves Renouard, *La papauté à Avignon* (Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1954); Bernard Guillemain, *Les papes d'Avignon (1309–1376)* (Editions du Cerf, Paris, 1998).

32 *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, H. Denifle and E. Châtelain (eds.), (4 vols., Delalain, Paris, 1889–97), vol. 3, p. 485, no.1023. Ockham had earlier been condemned at Avignon: see A. Pelzer, "Les 51 articles de Guillaume Ockham censures en Avignon en 1326," *Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique* 18 (1922), 240–70; C. K. Brampton, "Personalities at the Process against Ockham at Avignon 1324–26," *Franciscan Studies* 26 (1966), 4–25.

33 *Chartularium*, vol. 3, pp. 414–42, nos. 779–87.

34 Ockham, *Tractatus contra Johannem*, in *Guillelmi de Ockham Opera Politica* (3 vols., University of Manchester, Manchester, 1940–56), vol. 3, pp. 67–72.

35 *Opus nonaginta dierum*, cap. 123, in *Opera Politica*, vol. 2, pp. 832–46. As Lagarde notes, Ockham allows the pope spiritual *potestas*, rather than jurisdiction: Georges de Lagarde, *La naissance de l'esprit laïque au declin du moyen-âge* (6 vols., Editions Beatrice, Paris, 1940–6), vol. 5, p. 183. See further Brian Tierney, "Ockham,

the Conciliar Theory, and the Canonists," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 15 (1954), 40–70.

36 Ockham, *De corpore Christi*, T. B. Birch (ed.), (Lutheran Literary Board, Burlington, IA, 1930), cap. 5, 182–4; cap. 36, 444.

37 On which see Walter Ullmann, *The Origins of the Great Schism: A Study in Fourteenth-Century Ecclesiastical History* (Archon, Hamden, CT, 1972); Howard Kaminsky, *Simon de Cramaud and the Great Schism* (Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, NJ, 1983); Alan E. Bernstein, *Pierre d'Ailly and the Blanchard Affair: University and Chancellor of Paris at the Beginning of the Great Schism* (Brill, Leiden, 1978). The Pisa claimant was notable for his strong affinities with the theology of the *via moderna*: see F. Ehrle, *Der Sentenzenkommmtar Peters von Candia des Pisaner Papstes Alexanders V: Ein Beitrag zur Scheidung der Schulen in der Scholastik des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts und zur Geschichte des Wegestreits* (Aschendorff, Münster, 1925).

38 Heiko A. Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1963), pp. 378–90; John J. Ryan, *The Apostolic Conciliarism of Jean Gerson* (Scholars Press, Atlanta, GA, 1998).

39 For a helpful study of ecclesiastical inactivity in the fifteenth century in relation to matters of doctrine from the growth of heresy at the time, see John N. Stephens, "Heresy in Medieval and Renaissance Florence," *Past and Present* 54 (1972), 25–60. For the worsening of the situation in the sixteenth century, see the invaluable study of Gerhard Müller, *Die römische Kurie und die Reformation 1523–1534: Kirche und Politik während des Pontifikates Clemens VII* (Gerd Mohn, Gütersloh, 1969).

40 Phillip H. Stump, *The Reforms of the Council of Constance (1414–1418)* (Brill, Leiden, 1994). For the older literature, see Remigius Bäumer, "Die Reformkonzilien des 15. Jahrhunderts in der neueren Forschung," *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum* 1 (1969), 153–64.

41 Odilo Engels, "Zur Konstanzer Konzilsproblematik in der nachkonziliaren Historiographie des 15. Jahrhunderts," in R. Bäumer (ed.), *Von Konstanz nach Trient: Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte von den Reformkonzilien bis zum Tridentinum* (Schoningh, Paderborn, 1972), pp. 233–59. Disagreement about the status of Constance and Basle is also evident in the numeration of the ecumenical councils in contemporary sources: see Remigius Bäumer, "Die Zahl der allgemeinen Konzilien in der Sicht von Theologen des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts," *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum* 1 (1969), 288–313.

42 The defection of Nicholas of Cusa from a conciliar to a papal stance appears to have occasioned a crisis in humanist circles at the time: see James E. Biechler, "Nicholas of Cusa and the End of the Conciliar Movement: A Humanist Crisis of Identity," *Church History* 44 (1975), 5–21.

43 See the definitive study of Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change* (2 vols., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1979).

44 See James K. Farge, "Early Censorship of Printed Books in Paris: New Insights and Perspectives," in J. M. de Bujanda (ed.), *Le contrôle des idées à la Renaissance* (Droz, Geneva, 1996), pp. 75–91.

45 Hermann Schüssler, *Der Primät der Heiligen Schrift als theologisches und kanonistisches Problem im Spätmittelalter* (Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1977).

46 See, e.g., John J. Contreni, *The Cathedral School of Laon from c.850–c.1000* (Arbeo-Gesellschaft, Munich, 1978); John Marenbon, *From the Circle of Alcuin to the School of Auxerre: Logic, Theology and Philosophy in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1983).

47 Stephen C. Ferruolo, *The Origins of the University: The Schools of Paris and Their Critics, 1100–1215* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA, 1985).

48 For details of the controversy leading to these developments, see M.-M. Dufeil, *Guillaume de Saint-Amour et la polémique universitaire parisienne 1250–1259* (Picard, Paris, 1972), especially pp. 146–282.

49 For analysis of these developments as they bear on the medieval development of the doctrine of justification, see Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2nd edn., 1998), pp. 155–63.

50 See Adolar Zumkeller, "Die Augustinerschule des Mittelalters," *Analecta Augustiniana* 27 (1964), 167–262; A. E. McGrath, "'Augustinianism?' A Critical Assessment of the So-called 'Medieval Augustinian Tradition' on Justification," *Augustiniana* 31 (1981), 247–67.

51 Carl Stange, "Über Luthers Beziehungen zur Theologie seines Ordens," *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 11 (1900), 574–85.

52 Heinrich Hermelink, *Die theologische Fakultät in Tübingen vor der Reformation 1477–1534* (Paul Siebeck, Tübingen, 1906).

53 See Heiko A. Oberman, "*Facientibus quod in se est Deus non denegat gratiam*: Robert Holcot O. P. and the Beginnings of Luther's Theology," *HThR* 55 (1962), 317–42; Fritz Hoffmann, *Die theologische Methode des Oxforder Dominikanerlehrers Robert Holkot* (Aschendorff, Münster, 1972).

54 This point is usually emphasized in the course of discussing the *initia theologia Lutheri*. See, e.g., Alister E. McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross: Martin Luther's Theological Breakthrough* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1985), pp. 27–71, especially pp. 69–70. On the *via moderna* at Erfurt, see W. Urban, "Die 'via moderna' an der Universität Erfurt am Vorabend der Reformation," in H. A. Oberman (ed.), *Gregor von Rimini: Werk und Wirkung bis zur Reformation* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, 1981), pp. 311–30.

55 Note the comments of Bonaventura Pius de Costacciaro, made at Trent on December 28, 1546: *Concilium Tridentinum diarorum, actorum, epistularum, tractatuum nova collectio*, Goeresiana (ed.), (Societas Goeresiana, Freiburg, 1901–61), vol. 5, p. 741, lines 28–32. In fact, as Heynck has pointed out, there was considerable disagreement within the Franciscan contingent at Trent over the sensitive issue of precisely what Scotus's views on certain matters of significance were: Valens Heynck, "Controversy at the Council of Trent concerning the Doctrine of Duns Scotus," *FcS* 9 (1949), 181–258.

56 In general, see Daniel R. Lesnick, *Preaching in Medieval Florence: The Social World of Franciscan and Dominican Spirituality* (University of Georgia Press, Athens, GA, 1989). For a careful study of such a Franciscan spirituality towards the end of our period, see André Godin, *L'homélaire de Jean Vitrier: spiritualité franciscaine en*

Flandre au XVIe siècle (Droz, Geneva, 1971). Although the Franciscans were considerably more successful in their popular ministry than the Dominicans, certain difficulties are known to have remained: Paul L. Nyhus, *The Franciscans in South Germany 1400–1530: Reform and Revolution* (American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, 1975).

57 See Damasus Trapp, "Augustinian Theology of the Fourteenth Century," *Augustiniana* 6 (1956), 146–274. The terms *antiqui* and *moderni* assume a range of meanings in contemporary sources, in that they were employed in a variety of contexts, and for a variety of purposes, beyond distinguishing the views of Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus from those of William of Ockham and Gabriel Biel: see Elizabeth Gössmann, *Antiqui und Moderni im Mittellalter: Eine geschichtliche Standortsbestimmung* (Schoningh, Munich/Paderborn, 1974). The breadth of the problem is well illustrated from some recent studies, including Albert Zimmermann, *Antiqui und Moderni: Traditionsbewusstsein und Fortschrittsbewusstsein im spaten Mittelalter* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1974); Emidio Campi, *Via antiqua, umanesimo e riforma: Zwingli e la Vergine Maria* (Meynier, Turin, 1986).

58 See K. Bannach, *Die Lehre von der doppelten Macht Gottes bei Wilhelm von Ockham: Problemgeschichtliche Voraussetzungen und Bedeutung* (Steiner, Wiesbaden, 1975); Berndt Hamm, *Promissio, pactum, ordinatio: Freiheit und Selbstbindung Gottes in der scholastischen Gnadenlehre* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1977), pp. 340–90. It should be noted that the principle was originally intended to function primarily as a defense of the divine freedom in the face of thirteenth-century Averroist determinism: M. Grabmann, *Der lateinische Averroismus des 13. Jahrhunderts und seine Stellung zur christliche Weltanschauung* (Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie dedr Wissenshaften, Munich, 1931). For the development of the idea in the sixteenth century, see Miguel A. Granada, Yves Charles Zarka, and Guido Canziani, *Potentia dei: l'onnipotenza divina nel pensiero dei secoli XVIe XVII* (Angeli, Milan, 2000).

59 For these ideas in the Reformation and post-Reformation periods, see Granada et al., *Potentia Dei*.

60 *Aliquid autem est possibile deo dupliciter: vel secundum eius potentiam absolutam, qua potest omne id, quod non includit contradictionem; aut secundum eius potentiam ordinatam, secundum quam fit omne aliud, quod consonat legibus divinae iustitiae et regulis sapientiae eius, quod si fieret aliter et secundum alias leges statutas et ordinatas a divina voluntate, non inordinate fieret, set ita ordinate sicut modo secundum ista*

Reportatio Parisiensis IV dist. i q. 5 n. 2, as cited by Werner Dettloff, *Die Lehre von der acceptatio divina bei Johannes Duns Scotus mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Rechtfertigungslehre* (Dietrich Coelde Verlag, Werl, 1954), p. 206, n. 7.

61 *Haec distinctio non est sic intelligenda quod in Deo sint realiter duae potentiae quarum una sit ordinata et alia absoluta, quia unica est potentia in Deo ad extra, quae omni modi est ipse Deus. Nec sic est intelligenda quod aliqua potest Deus ordinate facere et aliqua potest absolute et non inordinate. Sed est intelligenda quod "posse aliquid" quandoque secundum leges ordinatas et institutas a Deo; et illa dicitur Deus posse facere de potentia ordinata.*

Quodl. VI q. 1; *Opera Theologica* (9 vols, St Bonaventure University Press, New York, 1966–85), vol. 9, pp. 585–6.

62 McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 100–9, 158–63.

63 Ibid., pp. 45–54. The older study of Paul Vignaux, *Justification et prédestination au XIVe siècle* (Vrin, Paris, 1934), is still valuable in documenting this controversy.

64 There was, in fact, a serious purpose to this apparently pointless speculation: see Alister E. McGrath, "*Homo assumptus*? A Study in the Christology of the *Via Moderna*, with Particular Reference to William of Ockham," *EThL* 60 (1985), 283–97. For more philosophical reflections on some of the issues, see Marilyn McCord Adams, *What Sort of Human Nature? Medieval Philosophy and the Systematics of Christology* (Milwaukee, 1999).

65 Thus Borchert speaks of the fourteenth century being characterized by "*Trennungstendenzen und häretischen Lehranschauungen eines abgewandelten Nestorianismus*": Ernst Borchert, *Einfluß des Nominalismus der Spätscholastik nach dem Traktat de communicatione idiomatum des Nikolaus Oresme* (Aschendorff, Münster, 1940), p. 151.

66 Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine. 4. Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300–1700)* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago/London, 1984), pp. 69–126.

67 See the important study of Stanley Chodorow, *Christian Political Theory and Church Politics in the Mid-Twelfth Century: The Ecclesiology of Gratian's Decretum* (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, 1972).

68 Pelikan, *Reformation of Church and Dogma*, pp. 10–68.

69 Edward B. King and Jacqueline T. Schaefer, *Saint Augustine and his Influence in the Middle Ages* (The Press of the University of the South, Sewanee, TN, 1988).

70 Trapp, "Augustinian Theology of the Fourteenth Century."

71 Jill Kraye, *Pseudo-Aristotle in the Middle Ages: The Theology and Other Texts* (Warburg Institute University of London, London, 1986); Marcello Caleo, *Verità e certezza della donazione di Costantino: Polemica con Lorenzo Valla* (Ler, Naples, 1990).

72 M. de Kroon, "Pseudo-Augustin im Mittelalter: Entwurf eines Forschungsberichts," *Augustiniana* 22 (1972), 511–30. For the problem in general, see John E. Chisholm, *The Pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon against the Pelagians and Celestinans* (University Press, Fribourg, 1980).

73 Oberman, *Harvest of Medieval Theology*, pp. 160–5, especially pp. 163–4.

74 See Johann Auer, *Die Entwicklung der Gnadenlehre in der Hochscholastik* (2 vols., Herder, Freiburg, 1942–51), vol. 2, p. 200.

75 Franz Ehrle, "Der Kampf um die Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin in den ersten fünfzig Jahren nach seinem Tod," *ZKTh* 37 (1913), 266–318.

76 See Paulus Rusch, "Mariologische Wertungen," *ZKTh* 85 (1963), 129–61, especially pp. 129–50.

77 F. de Guimarens, "La doctrine des théologiens sur l'Immaculée Conception de 1250 à 1350," *Etudes Franciscaines* 3 (1952), 181–203; 4 (1953), 23–51, 167–87; Ignatius Brady, "The Development of the Doctrine on the Immaculate Conception in the Fourteenth Century after Aureoli," *FcS* 15 (1955), 175–202. Similar developments may be documented within the Augustinian Order in the

later medieval period: G. Tumminello, *L'immacolata concezione di Maria et la scuola Agostiniana del secolo XIV* (Gregoriana, Rome, 1942).

78 Oberman, *Harvest of Medieval Theology*, pp. 286–92.

79 Wilfrid Werbeck, *Jacobus Perez von Valencia: Untersuchungen zu seiner Psalmenkommentar* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1959), pp. 214–15.

80 R. Weijenborg, "Doctrina de Immaculata Conceptione apud Ioannem de Paltz OESA, Magistrum Lutheri Novitii," *Virgo Immaculata* 14 (1957), 160–83.

81 David C. Steinmetz, *Misericordia Dei: The Theology of Johannes von Staupitz in its Late Medieval Setting* (Brill, Leiden, 1968), pp. 146–7.

82 *Monumenta conciliorum generalium seculi decimi quinti*, F. Palacky et al. (eds.), (3 vols., Typis C. R. Officinae Typographicae aulae et status, Vienna, 1857–1932), vol. 3, p. 362. For the broader issues, see Ernst Reiter, "Rezeption und Beachtung von Basler Dekreten in der Diözese Eichstätt unter Bischof Johann von Eych (1445–1464)," in Bäumer (ed.), *Von Konstanz nach Trient*, 215–32.

83 Pelikan, *Reformation of Church and Dogma*, p. 50.

84 Ibid., pp. 59–61.

85 For the so-called "semi-Pelagians," see Rebecca Harden Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency: A Study of the Semi-Pelagian Controversy* (Mercer University Press, Macon, GA, 1996).

86 As first pointed out by Henri Bouillard, *Conversion et grâce chez Thomas d'Aquin* (Aubier, Paris, 1944), pp. 99–123. See further M. Seckler, *Instinkt und Glaubenswille nach Thomas von Aquin* (Matthias Grunewald Verlag, Mainz, 1961), pp. 90–133.

87 See A. E. McGrath, "The Anti-Pelagian Structure of 'Nominalist' Doctrines of Justification," *EThL* 57 (1981), 107–19.

88 See Hubert Jedin, "Ein Turmerlebnis des jungen Contarinis," in *Kirche des Glaubens – Kirche der Geschichte: Ausgewählte Aufsätze und Vorträge I* (Herder Verlag, Freiburg, 1966), pp. 167–90; McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, pp. 9–10. On Contarini's role in the Italian Reformation, see Elisabeth G. Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini: Venice, Rome, and Reform* (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, 1993).

89 Harry J. McSorley, *Luther – Right or Wrong? An Ecumenical-Theological Study of Luther's Major Work, The Bondage of the Will* (Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, 1969), pp. 288–93.

90 Karl H. Ullmann, *Reformatoren vor der Reformation vornehmlich in Deutschland und den Niederlanden* (2 vols., Perthes, Hamburg, 1841–2).

91 Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation*, pp. 32–43.

92 In fact, it proves difficult to identify "Forerunners" on the basis of such a definition: see Alister E. McGrath, "Forerunners of the Reformation? A Critical Examination of the Evidence for Precursors of the Reformation Doctrines of Justification," *HThR* 75 (1982), 219–42.

93 See Heiko A. Oberman, "Headwaters of the Reformation: *Initia Lutheri – Initia Reformationis*," in H. A. Oberman (ed.), *Luther and the Dawn of the Modern Era* (Brill, Leiden, 1974), pp. 40–88.

94 For the text of the Parisian *Determinatio*, which illustrates this trend especially well, see *Collectio iudicorum de Novis Erroribus*, C. du Plessis d'Argéntre (ed.), (Paris, 1724), vol. 1, cols. 358–74.

95 McGrath, "Forerunners of the Reformation?" pp. 219–22, 228–30.
96 *Ecclesiastica historia secundum singulas centurias per aliquot studiosos et pios viros in urbe Magdeburgi* (Basle, 1559–74). See Heinz Scheible, *Die Entstehung der Magdeburger Zenturien* (Gerd Mohn, Gütersloh, 1966). The older study of A. Jundt, *Les Centuries de Magdebourg* (Aubier, Paris, 1883), is still a valuable introduction.
97 *Catalogus testium veritatis, quae ante nostrum aetatem reclamarunt Papae* (Basle, 1556).
98 Marcel Simon, "From Greek Hairesis to Christian Heresy," in William R. Schoedel and Robert L. Wilken (eds.), *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition* (Editions Beauchesne, Paris, 1979), pp. 101–16.
99 Herbert Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter: Untersuchungen über die geschichtlichen Zusammenhänge zwischen der Ketzerei, den Bettelorden und der religiösen Frauenbewegung um 12. und 13. Jahrhundert und über die geschichtlichen Grundlagen der deutschen Mystik* (Emil Ebering, Berlin, 1935). For his later reflections, see Herbert Grundmann, *Ketzergeschichte des Mittelalters* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1963).
100 Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation* (Blackwell, Oxford, 2002), p. xi: "I have written as a historian, not a theologian. I have taken 'heresy' to mean whatever the papacy explicitly or implicitly condemned during the period."
101 As demonstrated by Othmar Hageneder, "Der Häresiebegriff bei den Juristen des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts," in W. Lourdaux and D. Verhelst (eds.), *The Concept of Heresy in the Middle Ages* (Louvain University Press, Louvain, 1978), pp. 42–103.
102 Robert I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Power and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1990).
103 For the exploration of this point with reference to the continuity between medieval heresy and the Reformation, see René Bornert, *La réforme protestante du culte à Strasbourg au XVIe siècle (1523–1598.*
104 Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter*, pp. 50–1.

Chapter 2 Humanism and the Reformation

1 For useful analysis and comments, see Jacques Etienne, *Spiritualisme érasmien et théologiens louvainistes: un changement de problématique au début du XVIe siècle* (Publications universitaires de Louvain, Louvain/Gembloux, 1956); Charles G. Nauert, "The Clash of Humanists and Scholastics: An Approach to Pre-Reformation Controversies," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 4 (1973), 1–18.
2 Eckhard Bernstein, "From Outsiders to Insiders: Some Reflections on the Development of a Group Identity of the German Humanists between 1450 and 1530," in C. G. Nauert and J. V. Mehl (eds.), *In laudem Caroli: Renaissance and Reformation studies for Charles G. Nauert* (Sixteenth Century Publishers, Kirksville, MO, 1998), pp. 45–64.
3 Thus Schwarzerd became *Melanchthon*; Köpfel, *Capito*; Fischer, *Piscator*; Müller, *Molitor*; and Hausschein, *Oecolampadius*. There are important parallels here with the monastic novice adopting a new name as a token of becoming a member of a religious order. Entering a humanist sodality was widely regarded as representing

a transformation of the individual's *persona*. There was another reason for such name changes. These name changes often served to conceal the relatively low social status of the individuals concerned, allowing them to break free from the role that medieval society had predetermined for them, and assume their rightful place in the republic of letters. See Bernstein, "From Outsiders to Insiders," p. 51.

4 Helmar Junghans, "Der Einfluß des Humanismus auf Luthers Entwicklung bis 1518," *Luther-Jahrbuch* 37 (1970), 37–101, especially pp. 45–51; Donald Weinstein, "In Whose Image and Likeness? Interpretations of Renaissance Humanism," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 33 (1972), 165–76. On the concept of the "Renaissance," see Delio Cantimori, "Sulla storia dei concetto di Rinascimento," *Annali della scuola normale superiore di Pisa: Lettere, storia e filosophia*, 2nd series (1932), 229–68. The debate between Trier and Stackelberg also casts valuable light on the nuanced relationship between the Renaissance and classical antiquity: Jost Trier, "Zur Vorgeschichte des Renaissance-Begriff," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 33 (1955), 45–63; J. von Stackelberg, "Renaissance: 'Wiedergeburt' oder 'Wiederwunsch'? Zur Kritik an J. Triers Aufsatz über die Vorgeschichte des Renaissance-Begriffs," *BHR* 22 (1960), 406–20; Trier, "Wiederwunsch," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 43 (1961), 177–87.

5 Wallace K. Ferguson, *The Renaissance in Historical Thought: Five Centuries of Interpretation* (Houghton Mifflin, Boston, MA, 1948), pp. 195–252.

6 Giuseppe Toffanin, *Storia dell'umanesimo II: lumanesimo italiano* (Zanichelli, Bologna, 1964); *La religione degli umanisti* (Zanichelli, Bologna, 1950); *L'umanesimo di Dante e il cielo di Giove* (Societa Editrice Internazionale, Turin, 1959).

7 Hans Baron, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, revised edn., 1966). His earlier study maps out this approach in an interesting way: Hans Baron, *Cicero and the Roman Civic Spirit in the Middle Ages and the Early Renaissance* (Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1938). Baron's approach has recently been reevaluated, with particular reference to his treatment of Leonardo Bruni and Machiavelli: see Ronald Witt, "The 'Crisis' after Forty Years," *American Historical Review* 101 (1996), 110–18; John M. Najemy, "Baron's Machiavelli and Renaissance Republicanism," *American Historical Review* 101 (1996), 119–29.

8 See, for example, P. O. Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought and its Sources* (Columbia University Press, New York, 1979). For an overview of the American scholarly background to Kristeller's approach, see Edward Muir, "The Italian Renaissance in America," *American Historical Review* 100 (1995), 1095–1118.

9 Giorgio Radetti, "Le origini dell'umanesimo civile fiorentino nel 1400," *Giornale critico della filosophia italiana*, 3rd series, 12 (1959), 98–122; Giulio Cervani, "Il Rinascimento italiano nella interpretazione di Hans Baron," *Nuova rivista storica* 39 (1955), 492–503.

10 Jerrold E. Seigel, "'Civic Humanism' or Ciceronian Rhetoric? The Culture of Petrarch and Bruni," *Past and Present* 34 (1966), 3–48. For the subsequent debate, see Hans Baron, "Leonardi Bruno: 'Professional Rhetorician' or 'Civic Humanist'?" *Past and Present* 36 (1967), 21–37; David Rohey, "P. P. Vergerio

the Elder: Republicanism and Civic Values in the Work of an Early Humanist," *Past and Present* 58 (1973), 3–37.

11 Raymond Klibansky, *The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition during the Middle Ages* (Kraus, Munich, 1981). Marsilio Ficino is perhaps the most noted Christian Platonist of the period: see Michael J. B. Allen, "Marsilio Ficino on Plato, the Neoplatonists and the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity," *Renaissance Quarterly* 37 (1984), 555–84, and particularly his magisterial study *The Platonism of Marsilio Ficino: A Study of his Phaedrus Commentary, its Sources and Genesis* (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, 1984).

12 Charles B. Schmitt, *The Aristotelian Tradition and Renaissance Universities* (Variorum Reprints, London, 1984); Eugenio Garin, "Le traduzioni umanistische di Aristotele nel secolo XV," *Atti e memori dell'Accademia fiorentini di scienze morali "La Colombaria"* 16 (1951), 55–104; G. Toffanin, *Storia letteraria d'Italia: Il Cinquecento* (Vallardi, Milan, 6th edn, 1960), pp. 447–520; P. O. Kristeller, "Renaissance Aristotelianism," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 6 (1965), 157–74; *La tradizione aristotelica nel Rinascimento* (Antenore, Padua, 1972); *Aristotelis e sincretismo nel pensiero di Pietro Pomponazzi* (Antenore, Padua, 1983). Earlier, Hans Baron drew attention to the important role of Aristotle's *Ethics* in the development of "civic humanism": "Franciscan Poverty and Civic Wealth as Factors in the Rise of Humanistic Thought," *Speculum* 13 (1931), 1–37.

13 Antonio Poppi, "Il problema della filosophia morale nella scuola padovana dei Rinascimento: Platonismo e Aristotelismo nella definizione dei metodo dell'ethica," in *Platon et Aristote a Renaissance* (XVIe Colloque Internationale de Tours, Vrin, Paris, 1976), pp. 105–46.

14 Michel Reulos, "L'enseignement d'Aristote dans les collèges au XVIe siècle," in *Platon et Aristote à la Renaissance*, pp. 147–62. Note also the stipulation (p. 149) that Cicero is to be studied as an *orator*.

15 Hannah Holbom Gray, "Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence," in P. O. Kristeller and P. P. Wiener (eds.), *Renaissance Essays* (Harper & Row, New York, 1968), pp. 199–216.

16 Charles Trinkaus, "A Humanist's Image of Humanism: The Inaugural Orations of Bartolommeo della Fonte," *Studies in the Renaissance* 7 (1960), 90–147.

17 Wolfenbüttel, Cod. 43 Aug. Fol., ff. 141v–142v, cited in Trinkaus, "Bartolommeo della Fonte," p. 97 n. 26.

18 Wolfenbüttel, Cod. 43 Aug. Fol., ff. 142v–143r, cited in Trinkaus, "Bartolommeo della Fonte," p. 98 n. 27.

19 For the Enlightenment view of Luther as an intellectual liberator, see Heinrich Bornkamm, *Luther im Spiegel der deutschen Geistesgeschichte* (Quelle & Meyer, Heidelberg, 1955), pp. 14–15.

20 See, e.g., François Masai, *Plethon et la Platonisme de Mistra* (Societé d'édition "les Belles Lettres," Paris, 1956); D. P. Walker, *Spiritual and Demonic Magic from Ficino to Campanella* (Warburg Institute University of London, London, 1958); Frances Yates, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1967). On the origins and influence of hermeticism, see Garth Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1986).

21 See D. Harmening, "Faust und die Renaissance-Magie: Zum ältesten Faust-Zeugnis Oohannes Trithemius an Johannes Viridung, 1507," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 55 (1973), 56–79.

22 As suggested by Heinz Otto Burger, *Renaissance, Reformation, Humanismus* (Verlag Gehlen, Bad Homburg, 1969). Goethe's reworking of the Faust legend is significant in this connection. For Reuchlin's interest in this darker side of the Renaissance heritage, see Charles Zika, *Reuchlin und die okkulte Tradition der Renaissance* (Thorbecke, Sigmaringen, 1998).

23 E. Monnerjahn, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola: Ein Beitrag zur philosophischen Theologie des Humanismus* (Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1960).

24 Franco Gaeta, *Lorenzo Valla: filologia e storia nell'umanesimo* (Napoli Istituto Italiano per gli studi storici, Naples, 1955); Salvatore I. Camporeale, *Lorenzo Valla: umanesimo e teologia* (Istituto Palazzo Strozzi, Florence, 1972).

25 Note particularly how Auer demonstrated that Erasmus's ethical bias reflected the influence of the Greek fathers, rather than that of rationalism: Alfons Auer, *Die vollkommene Frömmigkeit des Christen* (Patmos-Verlag, Düsseldorf, 1954). Erasmus's continuity with the earlier catholic tradition is brought out by John B. Payne, *Erasmus: His Theology of the Sacraments* (John Knox Press, Richmond, VA, 1970).

26 On German humanism, see Gerhard Ritter, "Die geschichtliche Bedeutung des deutschen Humanismus," *Historische Zeitschrift* 127 (1922–3), 393–453; Heinz Entner, "Der Begriff 'Humanismus' als Problem der deutschen Literaturgeschichtsschreibung," *Klio* 40 (1962), 260–70; Richard Newald, *Probleme und Gestalte des deutschen Humanismus* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1963); Lewis W. Spitz, *The Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1963); Entner, "Probleme der Forschung zum deutschen Frühhumanismus 1400–1500," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Ernst-Moritz-Amdt-Universität Greifswald* 15 (1966), 587–90. On the Low Countries, see Jozef IJsewijn, "The Coming of Humanism to the Low Countries," in H. A. Oberman and Thomas A. Brady (eds.), *Itinerarium Italicum* (Brill, Leiden, 1975), pp. 193–304.

27 See the excellent survey of Alfred Noe, *Der Einfluss des italienischen Humanismus auf die deutsche Literatur vor 1600: Ergebnisse jüngerer Forschung und ihre Perspektiven* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1993).

28 For an excellent study of this important figure, who is hardly known in the English-speaking world, see Maja Eib, *Der Humanismus und sein Einfluss auf das Eheverständnis im 15. Jahrhundert: Eine philosophisch-moraltheologische Untersuchung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des frühhumanistischen Gedankenguts Albrechts von Eyb* (LIT Verlag, Münster, 2001).

29 P. O. Kristeller, "The European Diffusion of Italian Humanism," in *Renaissance Thought II: Papers on Humanism and the Arts* (Harper, New York, 1965), pp. 69–88, especially pp. 71–83. This essay may be supplemented by other works. For example, attention has been drawn to the role of northern European printing houses as channels for the diffusion of Italian humanism: see Friedrich Luchsinger, *Der Baslerbuchdruck als Vermittler italienischer Geistes* (Helbing & Lichtenhahn, Basle, 1953).

30 Note the famous remarks to Zwingli: "*Ego mundi civis esse cupio, communis omnium, vel peregrinis magis. Utinam contingat ascribi civitati coelesti*": *CR* (Zwingli) 7.580.

31 Despite the tendency of early German humanists such as Niklas von Wyle, Heinrich Steinhöwel, and Albrecht von Eyb to write in their native German, the German humanist movement rapidly adopted Latin as its favored language: see Eckhard Bernstein, *Die Literatur des deutschen Frühhumanismus* (Metzler, Stuttgart, 1978), 41–98.

32 See J. Huizinga, "Erasmus über Vaterland und Nationen," in *Gedenkschrift zum 400. Todesrtage des Erasmus* (Braus-Riggenbach, Basle, 1936), pp. 34–49. The relation of Latin and national languages is exhaustively discussed in Bodo Guthmüller (ed.), *Latein und Nationalsprachen in der Renaissance* (Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1998).

33 *CR* (Zwingli) 5.250.8–11. See W. P. Stephens, *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli* (Oxford University Press, Oxford 1986), pp. 7–8. Erasmus distanced himself from such matters: see *CR* (Zwingli) 8.37.8–9.

34 H. Glareanus, *Descriptio de situ Helvetiae et vicinus gentibus* (Basle, 1519). Vadian's assertion that Swiss national freedom must be defended *armis animisque* is sharply at odds with Erasmus's more cosmopolitan vision of humanism.

35 Bernstein, "From Outsiders to Insiders," p. 47.

36 See the excellent study of Christine Treml, *Humanistische Gemeinschaftsbildung: Sozio-kulturelle Untersuchung zur Entstehung eines neuen Gelehrtenstandes in der frühen Neuzeit* (Olms, Hildesheim, 1989) for comment, noting particularly the discussion of humanist sodalities at pp. 44–77. There are also some useful pointers in the papers collected in Richard C. Trexler, *Persons in Groups: Social Behavior as Identity Formation in Medieval and Renaissance Europe* (Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, Binghamton, NY, 1985).

37 Kenneth Goewens, "Ciceronianism and Collective Identity: Defining the Boundaries of the Roman Academy, 1525," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 23 (1993), 173–95.

38 For some examples, see Eckhart Bernstein, "Creating Humanist Myths: Two Poems by Ulrich von Hutten," in A. Dalzell, C. Fantazzi, and R. J. Schoeck (eds.), *Actus Conventus Neo-Latini Torontonensis* (Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, Binghampton, NY, 1991), pp. 249–60.

39 On the role of satire, see the careful study of Reinhard P. Becker, *A War of Fools: The Letters of Obscure Men. A Study of the Satire and the Satirized* (Peter Lang, Bern, 1981). More generally, see Barbara Becker-Cantarino, *Satire in der frühen Neuzeit* (Rodopi, Amsterdam, 1986).

40 See especially Kaspar Elm, "Verfall und Erneuerung des Ordenswesen in Spätmittelalter," in *Untersuchungen zu Kloster und Stift* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1980), pp. 188–238.

41 For the importance of this circle to the development of humanism and subsequently the Reformation in northern Europe, see Berndt Moeller, "Erwägungen zur Bedeutung Erfurts als Kommunikationszentrum der frühen Reformation," in U. Weiss (ed.), *Erfurt: Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Bohlau, Weimar, 1995), pp. 275–82.

42 The rise of classical scholarship is well documented in the following studies: Giuseppe Billanovich, "Petrarch and the Textual Tradition of Livy," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute* 14 (1951), 137–208; Winifried Trillitzsch,

"Erasmus und Seneca," *Philologus* 109 (1965), 270–93; Sesto Prete, "Leistungen der Humanisten auf dem Gebiete der lateinischen Philologie," *Philologus* 109 (1965), 259–69; Vittore Branca, "Ermolao Barbaro and Late Quattrocento Venetian Humanism," in J. R. Hale (ed.), *Renaissance Studies* (Humana Press, Totowa, NJ, 1973), 218–43; Antony Grafton, "On the Scholarship of Politian and its Context," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute* 40 (1977), 150–88; Charles G. Nauert, "Humanists, Scientist and Pliny: Changing Approaches to a Classical Author," *American Historical Review* 84 (1979), 72–85.

43 See George M. Logan, "Substance and Form in Renaissance Humanism," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 7 (1977), 1–34.

44 The emphasis upon the importance of particular circumstances, rather than universal categories, has been well documented in the cases of Bruni, Bude, and Poggio: see Nancy L. Struever, *The Language of History in the Renaissance* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970); Donald Kelley, *The Foundations of Modern Historical Scholarship* (Columbia University Press, New York, 1970).

45 A distinction is frequently made between *doctores* (e.g., Augustine) and *patres* (e.g., Origen) in sixteenth-century sources: see, e.g., *CR* (Zwingli) 1.366.24–5. The term "fathers" is used in the present study simply to designate an ecclesiastical writer, whether Greek- or Latin-speaking, of the first five centuries.

46 Frank Lestringant, *Mapping the Renaissance World: The Geographical Imagination in the Age of Discovery* (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, 1994).

47 It is thus significant that Vadian's first major exegetical work was his commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, which highlighted the experiential aspects of the early church: Conradin Bonorand, *Vadians Weg vom Humanismus zur Reformation und seine Vorträge über die Apostelgeschichte* (Verlag der Fehr'schen Buchhandlung, Vadian-Studien 7, St Gallen, 1962).

48 See Berndt Moeller, "Die deutschen Humanisten und die Anfänge der Reformation," *ZKG* 70 (1959), 46–61, 54.

49 K. E. van Liere, "Humanism and Scholasticism in Sixteenth-Century Academe: Five Student Orations from the University of Salamanca," *Renaissance Quarterly* 53 (2000), 57–107; Lech Szczucki, "Between Scholasticism and Humanism: Philosophy at the University of Cracow in the Sixteenth Century," *Giornale critico della filosofia italiana* 7 (1987), 220–34; James H. Overfield, *Humanism and Scholasticism in Late Medieval Germany* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1984). See further Etienne, *Spiritualisme érasmien et théologiens louvainistes*; Nauert, "Clash of Humanists and Scholastics."

50 Moeller, "Die deutschen Humanisten," pp. 53–4.

51 Ibid., p. 53.

52 See the careful study of Pierre Fraenkel, *Testimonia Patrum: The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon* (Droz, Geneva, 1961).

53 H. A. Oberman, *Werden und Wertung der Reformation* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1977), pp. 93–5.

54 Berndt Moeller, "Zwinglis Disputationen: Studien zu den Anfängen der Kirchenbildung und des Synodalwesens im Protestantismus," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonische Abteilung*, 56 (1970), 275–324, 60 (1974), 213–364.

55 It was not a "disputation" in the strict academic sense of the term. For a full discussion and analysis, see Oberman, *Werden und Wertung der Reformation*, pp. 237–66.

56 Berndt Moeller, "Die Ursprunge der reformierten Kirche," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 100 (1975), 642–53.

57 See the classic study of Emil Egli, "Zur Einführung des Schriftprinzips in der Schweiz," *Zwingliana* 1 (1903), 332–9.

58 See the study of Ernst Ziegler, "Zur Reformation als Reformation des Lebens und der Sitten," *Rorschacher Neujahrsblatt* (1984), 53–71. The older study of H. A. E. van Gelder, *The Two Reformations in the 16th Century: A Study of the Religious Aspects and Consequences of the Renaissance and Humanism* (Martinus Nijhof, The Hague, 1961), should also be consulted on this point.

59 See Hans von Greyerz, "Studien der Kulturgeschichte der Stadt Bern am Ende des Mittelalters," *Archiv des Historischen Vereins des Kantons Bern* 35 (1940), 175–491; Werner Näf, "Schweizerische Humanismus: Zu Glareans "Helvetiae Descriptio," *Schweizerische Beiträge allgemeinen Geschichte* 5 (1947), 186–98; W. Näf, *Vadian und seine Stadt St Gallen* (2 vols, Verlag der Fehr'schen Buchhandlung, St Gall, 1944–57), vol. 1, pp. 335–60, vol. 2, pp. 55–121.

60 For the influence of patriotism upon the young Zwingli, see Stephens, *Theology of Huldrych Zwingli*, pp. 7–8.

61 Franz Stuhlhofer, *Humanismus zwischen Hof und Universität: Georg Tannstetter (Collimitius) und sein wissenschaftliches Umfeld im Wien des frühen 16. Jahrhunderts* (Wiener Universitätsverlag, Vienna, 1996). See also the earlier study of Conradin Bonorand, "Die Bedeutung der Universität Wien für Humanismus I; Reformation, insbesondere in der Ostschweiz," *Zwingliana* 12 (1964–8), 162–80, and the more detailed recent study of Michael H. Shank, *"Unless you Believe, you Shall not Understand": Logic, University, and Society in Late Medieval Vienna* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1988).

62 Dennis D. Martin, "The *Via Moderna*, Humanism and the Hermeneutics of Late Medieval Monastic Life," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 51 (1990), 179–97.

63 Gustav Bauch, *Die Rezeption des Humanismus in Wien* (M. & H. Marcus, Breslau, 1903). For a valuable analysis of the situation at the turn of the century, see Elisabeth Brandstätter and Hans Trümpy (eds.), *Arbogast Strub* (Vadian-Studien 5, Verlag der Fehr'schen Buchhandlung, St Gallen, 1955), 5–12. On the rhetorical tradition at Vienna, see Matthäus Gabathuler (ed.), *Joachim Vadian: Lateinische Reden* (Vadian-Studien 3, Verlag der Fehr'schen Buchhandlung, St Gallen, 1953), pp. 17⋆–23⋆.

64 Bonorand, "Die Bedeutung der Universität Wien für Humanismus," p. 166, gives the following matriculation figures at various universities for the summer term of the academic year 1515–16: Vienna – c. 355; Cologne – c. 200; Freiburg im Breisgau – 54; Rostock – 114; Ingolstadt – c. 210; Leipzig – c. 210; Heidelberg (for the entire year 1516) – 140; Wittenberg – 90; Tübingen – 52; Basle – 32.

65 The little monograph of Erwin Liefert, *Zwingli in Wien* (Wiener Universitätsverlag, Vienna, 1984), summarizes the present state of research.

66 See Conradin Bonorand, *Aus Vadians Freundes- und Schülerkreis in Wien* (Vadian-Studien 8, Verlag der Fehr'schen Buchhandlung, St Gallen, 1965), pp. 17–87, for further details.

67 See the summary of Heinz Haffter, "Vadian und die Universität Wien," *Wiener Geschichtsblätter* 20 (1965), 385–90 (The author's name is incorrectly spelled as "Hafter" therein). Other notable humanists include Georg Collimitius, center of the *Sodalitas Collimitiana*, and Johannes Cuspinian: see Hans Ankwicz-Kleehoven, *Der Wiener Humanist Johannes Cuspinian, Gelehrter und Diplomat zur Zeit Kaiser Maximilians I* (Bohlaus, Graz, 1959); Bonorand, *Vadians Freundes- und Schülerkreis*, pp. 80–7; Stuhlhofer, *Humanismus zwischen Hof und Universität*. For some concerns about the reliability of our knowledge of some of these sodalities, see the important study of Moritz Csaky, "Die Sodalitas litteraria Danubiana: Historische Realität oder poetistche Ficktion des Conrad Celtis?" in H. Zeman (ed.), *Die österreichische Literatur: Ihr Profil von den Anfängen im Mittelalter bis zum 18. Jahrhundert* (Bohlaus, Graz, 1985), pp. 739–85.

68 See Kurt Maeder, *Die via media in der schweizerischen Reformation: Studien zum Problem der Kontinuität im Zeitalter der Glaubenspaltung* (Zwingli Verlag, Zurich, 1970), pp. 37–53.

69 Eduard Buechler, *Die Anfänge des Buchdrucks in der Schweiz* (Schweizerisches Gutenbergmuseum, Berne, 2nd edn, 1951). More generally, see F. L. Hoffmann, *Bibliography of the History of printing in Switzerland* (Chicago Club of Printing House Craftsmen, Chicago, 1941).

70 Maeder, *Die via media in der schweizerischen Reformation*, pp. 47–9. For Vadian's impact on eastern Europe, see Conradin Bonorand, "Joachim Vadians Beziehungen zu Ungarn," *Zwingliana* 13 (1969), 97–131; "Joachim Vadian und Johannes Dantiscus: Ein Beitrag zu den schweizerisch-polnischen Beziehungen im 16. Jahrhundert," *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ermlands* 35 (1971), 150–70.

71 Bonorand, *Vadians Weg vom Humanismus zur Reformation und seine Vorträge über die Apostelgeschichte*, 91–100.

72 See, e.g., *CR* (Zwingli) 1.10–22, in which the ox represents the Swiss, and the cats the foreign powers exploiting them.

73 Conradin Bonorand, *Vadian und die Ereignisse in Italien im ersten Drittel des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Vadian-Studien 13, Verlag der Fehr'schen Buchhandlung, St Gallen, 1985), pp. 43–54.

74 Erasmus's *Querela Pacis* was published at Basle in 1517. For its influence upon Zwingli, see Joachim Rogge, *Zwingli und Erasmus: Die Friedensgedanken des jungen Zwinglis* (Calwer Verlag, Stuttgart, 1962). For Zwinglis favorable comments on Myconius's work, see *CR* (Zwingli) 7.231.11–13.

75 Hans Trümpy, "Glarner Studenten im Zeitalter des Humanismus," *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Landes Glarus: Festgabe des Historischen Vereins des Kantons Glarus* (Historischer Verein des Kantons Glarus, Glarus, 1952), pp. 273–84.

76 Trümpy gives the following breakdown for the 13 students he documented (281): Basle – 1; Freiburg – 2; Heidelberg – 6; Cologne – 1; Leipzig – 1; Tübingen – 1; Vienna – 1.

77 Guido Kisch, "Forschungen zur Geschichte des Humanismus in Basel," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 40 (1958), 194–221. The conflict between *mos gallicus* and *mos italicus* illustrate the tensions at such universities in the late medieval period: see Kisch, *Humanismus und Jurisprudenz: Der Kampf zwischen mos italicus und mos gallicus an der Universität Basel* (Helbing & Lichtenhahn, Basle, 1955); Peter Bietenholz, *Der italienische Humanismus und die Blütezeit des Buchdrucks in Basel* (Helbing & Lichtenhahn, Basle, 1959). Later, of course, the strongly Erasmian Oecolampadius settled at Basle: J. J. Herzog, *Das Leben Johannes Oekolampads und die Reformation der Kirche zu Basel* (2 vols, Schweighauser'schen Buchhandlung, Basle, 1843); Ernst Staehelin, *Das theologische Lebenswerk Johannes Oekolampads* (Heinsius, Leizig, 1939). On Capito's time at Basle, see James M. Kittelson, *Wolfgang Capito: From Humanist to Reformer* (Brill, Leiden, 1975), pp. 23–51.

78 Albert Büchi, "Glareans Schüler in Paris," in *Festschrift für Robert Durrer* (Stans, 1928), pp. 372–421. On his earlier and later periods, see Marc Sieber, "Glarean in Basel, 1514–1517 und 1522–1529," *Jahrbuch des Historischen Vereins des Kantons Glarus* 60 (1963), 53–75.

79 See Wilhelm H. Neuser, *Die reformatorische Wende bei Zwingli* (Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen, 1977), pp. 38–74. For the autobiographical passages in question, see Ulrich Gäbler, *Huldrych Zwingli im 20. Jahrhundert: Forschungsbericht und annotirte Bibliographie 1897–1972* (Theologischer Verlag, Zurich, 1975), pp. 41–4.

80 *CR* (Zwingli) 1.236–7.

81 Ibid., 1.247.5–23.

82 Ibid., 2.132–5.

83 For an analysis of the 23 works by Erasmus, see Walther Köhler, *Huldrych Zwinglis Bibliothek* (Kommissionsverlag Beer, Zurich, 1921), pp. 14–16. Ten other works by Erasmus were known to Zwingli, although not in his personal possession. A comparison with Vadian's library is instructive: see Verena Schenkel Frei, *Bibliotheca Vadiana: Die Bibliothek des Humanisten Joachim von Watt nach dem Katalog des Josua Kessler von 1553* (Vadian-Studien 9, Verlag der Fehr'schen Buchhandlung, St Gallen, 1973). For the importance of the phenomenon of marginal annotations, see H. J. Jackson, *Marginalia: Readers' Writing in Books* (Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 2001).

84 Interestingly, Zwingli's personal edition of the *Novum Instrumentum* is that of 1519, not 1516: Köhler, *Zwinglis Bibliothek*, n. 106.

85 See the comments of J. F. Gerhard Goeters, "Zwinglis Werdegang als Erasmianer," in M. Greschat and J. F. C. Goeters (eds.), *Reformation und Humanismus: Robert Stupperich zum 65. Geburtstag* (Luther Verlag, Witten, 1969), pp. 255–71, especially pp. 268–9.

86 His acid comments concerning the Vulgate translator's audacity may be noted: *CR* (Zwingli) 3.682.25–7.

87 *Heinrich Bullingers Reformationgeschichte*, J. J. Hottinger and H. H. Vögeli (eds.), (2 vols, Beyel, Frauenfeld, 1838–40), vol. 1, p. 8.

88 For example, Gottfried W. Locher, "Zwingli und Erasmus," *Zwingliana* 13 (1969), 37–61. See James M. Stayer, "Zwingli before Zürich: Humanist Reformer and Papal Partisan," *ARG* 72 (1981), 55–68.

89 See A. E. McGrath, "Humanist Elements in the Early Reformed Doctrine of Justification," *ARG* 73 (1982), 5–20; Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2nd edn., 1998), pp. 219–21.

90 For the question of the date of Zwingli's inception as a theological Reformer, see Neuser, *Die reformatorische Wende bei Zwingli*, pp. 38–74.

91 *CR* (Zwingli) 7.245.14–15.

92 This may be seen as marking the break with Erasmus: see Arthur Rich, *Die Anfänge dir Theologie Huldrych Zwinglis* (Zwingli Verlag, Zurich, 1949), pp. 96–104, 119–23.

93 This is a relatively common feature of the religious thought of Swiss and Rhineland Reformers of this transitional period, such as Zwingli's colleague Leo Jud: Karl-Heinz Wyss, *Leo Jud: Seine Entwicklung zum Reformator 1519–1523* (Peter Lang, Berne/Frankfurt, 1976), pp. 80–3.

94 See Richard Stauffer, "Einfluß und Kritik des Humanismus in Zwinglis *Commentari de vera et falsa religione*," *Zwingliana* 16 (1983), 97–110.

95 *CR* (Zwingli) 8.333.26–9: "*Erasmus Roterodamus ubi commentarium nostrum in manum cepit, ut familiaris quidem eius prodit, dixit: O bone Zwingli, quid scribis, quod ipse prius non scripserim!*"

96 Stauffer, "Einfluß und Kritik des Humanismus," pp. 99–102. For the tensions between the French monarch and the theologians of the Sorbonne around this time, see James K. Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France: The Faculty of Theology of Paris, 1500–1543* (Brill, Leiden, 1985).

97 cf. Cicero, *De natura deorum*, ii, 28.

98 *CR* (Zwingli) 3.641.

99 Ibid., 3.705.7–10.

100 An uncritical assessment of the *Commentarius* greatly reduces the value of the study of Dorothy Clark, "Erasmus and Zwingli's *On the True and False Religion*," in E. J. Furcha and H. Wayne Pipkin (eds.), *Prophet, Pastor, Protestant: The Work of Huldrych Zwingli after Five Hundred Years* (Pickwick Publications, Allison Park, PA, 1984), pp. 23–42. As Stauffer suggests, Erasmus's remark reported by Zwingli is best understood if it is assumed that the humanist read no futher than the dedicatory epistle to the work, with its scathing references to scholastic theology, and did not notice the critique of his own position developed later in the work.

101 Stauffer, "Einfluß und Kritik des Humanismus," pp. 105–8; Stephens, *Theology of Huldrych Zwingli*, pp. 148–9.

102 The possible impact of Zwingli's near-fatal illness in 1519, during which an autobiographical text (the *Pestlied*) indicates a growing awareness of divine providence, is of interest here: Rich, *Anfänge der Theologie Huldrych Zwinglis*, pp. 104–19.

103 *CR* (Zwingli) 6 iii.92.19–114.9. For comparable statements in the *Commentarius* (although without the sustained appeal to Seneca), see *CR* (Zwingli) 3.647.7–16. It must be appreciated that the sixteenth century witnessed a considerable revival in interest in Stoicism (and hence both Seneca and Cicero): see Leontine Zanta, *La renaissance du stoïcisme au XVIe siècle* (Slatkine, Geneva, 1975).

104 Stauffer, "Einfluß und Kritik des Humanismus," pp. 108–9.
105 The best study is Martin Greschat, *Martin Bucer: Ein Reformator und seine Zeit* (C. H. Beck, Munich, 1990). Two earlier studies of Greschat are invaluable: "Die Anfänge der reformatorisch Theologie Martin Bucers," in M. Greschat and J. F. G. Goeters (eds.), *Reformation und Humanismus: Robert Stupperich zum 65. Geburtstag* (Luther Verlag, Witten, 1969), pp. 124–40; "Der Ansatz der Theologie Martin Bucers," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 103 (1978), 81–96. The older study of Henri Strohl, "Théologie et humanisme à Strasbourg au moment de la création de la Haute-Ecole," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse* 17 (1937), 435–56, is still important.
106 Martin Greschat, "Martin Bucers Bücherverzeichnis," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 57 (1975), 162–85.
107 R. Raubenheimer, "Martin Bucer und seine humanistischen Speyerer Freunde," *Blätter für pfälzische Kirchengeschichte und religiöse Volkskunde* 32 (1965), 1–52.
108 The best text of this letter, dated May 1, 1518, is to be found at *WA* 9.160–9: see Greschat, "Ansatz der Theologie Martin Bucers," p. 94, n. 53.
109 This was first clearly shown by Karl Koch, *Studium Pietatis: Martin Bucer als Ethiker* (Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen, 1962), 10–15.
110 See the highly perceptive comments of Robert Stupperich, *Der Humanismus und die Wiedervereinigung der Konfessionen* (Heinsius, Leipzig, 1936), p. 23.
111 Johannes Müller, *Martin Bucers Hermeneutik* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Gütersloh, 1965), pp. 142–50. This point will be further developed in chapter 5.
112 Koch sees this maxim as the key to Bucer's theology: *Studium Pietatis*, p. 8.
113 F. Krüger, *Bucer und Erasmus: Eine Untersuchung zum Einfluß des Erasmus auf die Theologie Martin Bucers* (Steiner, Wiesbaden, 1975); McGrath, "Humanist Elements in the Early Reformed Doctrine of Justification," pp. 10–14; McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 221–2.
114 The debate within the literature is sterile and inconclusive, and points to a date in 1533. Beyond this, it seems that little may be said, in that documentary evidence is wanting. See P. Sprenger, *Das Rätsel um die Bekehrung Calvins* (Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen, 1960); Jean Cadier, "Le conversion de Calvin," *Bulletin de la societé de l'histoire du protestantisme français* 116 (1970), 142–51; Harro Höpfl, *The Christian Polity of John Calvin* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1985), pp. 219–26.
115 The work is best studied in the modern edition of F. L. Battles and A. M. Hugo, *Calvin's Commentary on Seneca's "de Clementia"* (Brill, Leiden, 1969).
116 See Quirinius Breen, *John Calvin: A Study in French Humanism* (Archon Books, Hamden, 2nd edn., 1968).
117 See the classic study of Ford Lewis Battles, "God was Accommodating Himself to Human Capacity," *Interpretation* 31 (1977), 19–38. Further useful studies may be found in David F. Wright, "Accommodation and Barbarity in John Calvin's Old Testament Commentaries," in A. G. Auld (ed.), *Understanding Poets and Prophets* (JSOT Press, Sheffield, 1993), pp. 413–27.
118 See, for example, Stephen D. Benin, *The Footprints of God: Divine Accommodation in Jewish and Christian Thought* (State University of New York Press, Albany, NY, 1993).

119 See the analysis in Manfred Hoffmann, *Rhetoric and Theology: The Hermeneutic of Erasmus* (University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1994), pp. 106–12. His older study, *Erkenntnis und Verwirklichung der wahren Theologie nach Erasmus von Rotterdam* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1972), is also of continuing importance.

120 See, for example, *Opera Omnia*, vol. 7, 17C; 825D; 894E.

121 Alexandre Ganoczy, *Le jeune Calvin: Genèse et évolution de sa vocation réformatrice* (Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1966), pp. 271–300.

122 For reflections on the historical senses of this term, see Leslie Levin, *Metaphors of Conversion in Seventeenth-Century Spanish Drama* (Tamesis, Rochester, NY, 1999); Arthur D. Nock, *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1972); Michael Wolfe, *The Conversion of Henri IV: Politics, Power and Religious Belief in Early Modern France* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1993).

123 Richard Stauffer, *Problèmes et méthodes d'histoire des religions* (Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1968), pp. 262–4. It is, of course, far from clear how Lefèvre's style of humanism relates to the onset of the Reformation: see Richard Stauffer, "Lefèvre d'Etaples, artisan ou spectateur de la Reforme?, *Bulletin de La societé de l'histoire du protestantisme français* 113 (1967), 405–23; Henry Heller, "The Evangelicalism of Lefèvre d'Etaples: 1525," *Studies in the Renaissance* 19 (1972), 42–77.

124 François Wendel, *Calvin et l'humanisme* (Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1976). The older study of Josef Bohatec, *Budé und Calvin: Studien zur Gedankenwelt des französischen Frühhumanismus* (Bohlaus, Graz, 1950) remains valuable as an account of Calvin's relation to early French humanism. This should be supplemented with the important study of Michael L. Monheit, "Guillaume Budé, Andrea Alciato, Pierre de l'Estoile: Renaissance Interpreters of Roman Law," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 68 (1997), 21–40.

125 See Jean Boisset, *Sagesse et saintété dans la pensée de Jean Calvin* (Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1959); Charles Partee, *Calvin and Classical Philosophy* (Brill, Leiden, 1977). The suggestion that Calvin was influenced by Stoicism (rather than merely using it as a means towards his own ends), may be regarded as lacking substantiation: Zanta, *Renaissance du stoïcisme*, 47–73; Jean Cadier, "Le pretendu stoicisme de Calvin," *Etudes théologiques et religieuses* 41 (1966), 217–26.

126 Even here, of course, it is necessary to observe that some contemporary humanists recognize precisely such a dichotomy. Budé's *De transitu hellenismi ad christianismum* (1535), dating from the same period as Calvin's "conversion," may be studied with some profit in this connection.

127 Egli Grislis, "Calvin's Use of Cicero in the Institutes 1:1–5 – A Case Study in Theological Method," *ARG* 62 (1971), 5–37.

128 *De natura deorum*, I.xvi.43. See further the references collected by Grislis, "Calvin's Use of Cicero," pp. 5–6. For a discussion, see Knut Kleve, *Gnosis Theon: Die Lehre von der natürlichen Gotteserkenntnis in der epikureischen Theologie* (Universitetsforlaget, Oslo, 1963).

129 *Institutio* I.iii.1. See further Grislis, "Calvin's Use of Cicero," pp. 6–9.

130 *De natura deorum*, I.xvii.45.

131 Grislis, "Calvin's Use of Cicero," pp. 13–14.

132 See Edward A. Dowey, *The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology* (Columbia University Press, New York, 1952), pp. 50–147. For criticism of this position, see T. H. L. Parker, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God* (Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh, 1969).

133 Dowey, *The Knowledge of God*, pp. 148–242.

134 McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 223–6. For the similarities between Calvin and Bernard of Clairvaux on this point, see Dennis E. Tamburello, *Union with Christ: John Calvin and the Mysticism of St. Bernard* (Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, KY, 1994).

135 See Rodolphe Peter, "Rhétorique et prédication selon Calvin," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 55 (1975), 249–72. This displaces the merits of the somewhat breezy study of Quirinius Breen, "John Calvin and the Rhetorical Tradition," *Church History* 26 (1957), 3–21.

136 Compare Peter, "Rhétorique et prédication," with Benoit Girardin, *Rhétorique et théologique: Calvin, le commentaire de l'epître aux Romains* (Éditions Beauchesne, Paris, 1979).

137 *WATr*, 1.624: "*Doctrina et vita sunt distinguenda. Vita est mala apud nos sicut apud papistas; non igitur de vita dimicamus et damnamus eos.*" *WATr*, 4.4338: "*Sed doctrina non reformata frustra fit reformatio morum.*"

138 See Bengt Hägglund, "Martin Luther über die Sprache," *Neue Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie* 26 (1984), 1–14, for an analysis of the importance of *die Sprache* for Luther's theology.

139 See the letter to Oecolampadius of June 20, 1523, *WABr*, 3.98.18–25:

> *Ipse fecit, ad quod ordinatus fuit: linguas introduxit et a sacrilegis studiis avocavit. Forte et ipse cum Mose in campestribus Moab morietur, nam ad meliora studia (quod in pietatem pertinet) non provehit. Vellemque mirum in modum abstinere ipsum a tractandis scripturis sanctis et paraphrasibus suis, quod non sit par istis officis et lectores frustra occupat et moratur in scripturis discendis. Satis fecit, quod malum ostendit, bonum ostendere (ut video) et in terram promissionis ducere non potest.*

140 On Scheurl, see Wilhelm Graf, *Doktor Christoph Scheurl von Nürnberg* (Gerstenberg, Hildesheim, 1972). More generally, see Alister E. McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross: Martin Luther's Theological Breakthrough* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1985), pp. 27–32. The study of Helmar Junghans, "Der Einfluß des Humanismus auf Luthers Entwicklung bis 1518," *Luther-Jahrbuch* 37 (1970), 37–101, contains valuable insights, further developed in his major study *Der junge Luther und die Humanisten* (Mohr, Göttingen, 1985), which contains a particularly valuable study of Luther's relation to the Erfurt humanism associated with Nikolaus Marschalk. More generally, see Maria Grossmann, *Humanism in Wittenberg 1485–1517* (de Graaf, Nieuwkoop, 1975).

141 *WABr*, 1.65.18.

142 Ibid., 1.65.24–66.1.

143 We have Karlstadt's own account of such a disputation: Ernst Kähler, *Karlstadt und Augustin: Der Kommentar des Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt zu Augustins Schrift "De Spiritu et Litera"* (Martin Niemeyer, Halle, 1952), 4.13–22:

Exurrexit dei ope quidam de nostris Venerandus Pater Martinus Luther et arcium acutissimus et theologiae doctor acerrimus atque eorundem fratrum per Saxoniam Vicarius, qui meraciores sanctae scripturae litteras perdidicit et earum succum ultra fidem epotavit asserebatque scholasticos doctores et a Christi non solum documentis sed et intelligentia tam Augustini (cuius documenta frequentius citat) tam aliorum similium esse alienissimos. Verumtamen ego de mea intelligentia atque scholasticorum dexteritate confidebam intra me sicut phariseus ille, qui et mussitare et clamore in disputationibus (more solicito), quod deficiente veritate non valui, affirmare cepi.

144 Kähler, *Karlstadt und Augustin*, 4.22–8 ". . . *Sed mihi ita inclamanti prisceque moriae meae laudes profundenti pius Pater respondebat pie: ego te, ait, arbitrium diligenter monumenta ecclesiasticorum rimantem seligo constituoque.*"

145 For the origins of this practice, see Marcia Colish, "The Sentence Collection and the Education of Professional Theologians in the Twelfth Century," in Nancy van Deusen (ed.), *The Intellectual Climate of the Early University* (Medieval Institute Publications Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI, 1997), pp. 1–26. On Karlstadt's knowledge of scholastic theology, see *Scriptorum insignium qui in celeberrimius praesertim Lipsiensi, Wittenbergensi, Francoforti ad Oderam academiis afundatione ipsarum usque ad annum Christum 1515 floruerunt centuria*, J. F. L. T. Merzdorf (ed.), (Leipzig, 1839), pp. 82–3, in which an anonymous peripatetic humanist singles out Karlstadt's learning for particular comment (and, incidentally, makes no reference to Luther).

146 Kähler, *Karlstadt und Augustin*, 5.4–7. Kähler's suggestion (p. 54 n. 1) that Karlstadt purchased the "Paris edition of 1515" rests upon a misunderstanding to be discussed in chapter 6 (see p. 000). The theses were published on April 26. For the text, see Kähler, *Karlstadt und Augustin*, 11⋆–36⋆. For Luther's favorable comments, see *WABr*, 1.94.15–25.

147 Note his favorable references to *noster Erasmus*: e.g., Kähler, *Karlstadt und Augustin*, 100.31–101.1, and particuiarly his *Epistola adversus ineptam et ridiculam inventionem J. Eckii* (Leipzig, 1519).

148 *WABr*, 1.99.8–13.

149 Kähler, *Karlstadt und Augustin*, 9.29–10.5.

150 For Luther's own account of these changes, see *WABr*, 1.153.3–154.1.

151 For Melanchthon's relation to Tübingen humanism in the period 1512–18, see Oberman, *Werden und Wertung der Reformation*, pp. 17–27, 72–81. On December 10, 1518, Spalatin reported that Melanchthon's lectures on Greek were attended by some four hundred students, roughly two-thirds of the student body: *WABr*, 1.197 n. 10.

152 Luther regarded the entire theological faculty, as well as the university itself, as being committed to this program: *WABr*, 1.170.22–5.

153 For references and discussion, see McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, pp. 15–19.

154 See the discussion in Heiko A. Oberman, "Headwaters of the Reformation: *Initia Lutheri – Initia Reformationis*," in H. A. Oberman (ed.), *Luther and the Dawn of the Modern Era* (Brill, Leiden, 1974), pp. 40–88.

155 See the letter of February 13, 1514 to Georg Spalatin: Johann Friedrich Heckel, *Manipulus primus epistolarum singularium* (Typis Hallerianis, Halle, 1695), pp. 17–20. On the controversy, see Hans Peterse, *Jacobus Hoogstraeten gegen Johannes Reuchlin: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Antijudaismus im 16. Jahrhundert* (Zabern, Mainz, 1995); Guido Kisch, *Zasius und Reuchlin: eine rechtsgeschichtlich-vergleichende Studie zum Toleranzproblem im 16. Jahrhundert* (Thorbecke, Konstanz, 1961).

156 See the careful study of Berndt Moeller, "Luther und die Städte," in *Aus der Lutherforschung: Drei Vorträge* (Westdeutscher Verlag, Opladen, 1983), pp. 9–26, especially pp. 16–24.

157 F. Leitschuh, *Albrecht Dürers Tagebuch der Reise in die Niederlande* (Leonhard Simion, Berlin, 1908), p. 84.

158 Moeller, "Die deutschen Humanisten und die Anfange der Reformation."

159 The importance of being fully integrated within such cultural and academic groupings as a means of influencing public debates is stressed by recent writers such as Erika Rummel, *The Humanist-Scholastic Debate in the Renaissance and Reformation* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1995); Charles G. Nauert, *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1995).

160 The tension between the ethical and pedagogical optimism evident in humanist educational writings – such as Erasmus, *Declamatio de pueris insliluendis*, Jean-Claude Margolin (ed.), (Droz, Geneva, 1966) – and the more pessimistic anthropology of Lutheranism appears to have exercised little influence over the practical affair of education: see further Gerald Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning: Indoctrination of the Young in the German Reformation* (Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1978).

161 See Wilhelm Maurer, "Melanchthons Loci Communes von 1521 als wissenschaftliche Programmschrift: Ein Beitrag zur Hermeneutik der Reformationszeit," *Luther-Jahrbuch* 27 (1960), 1–50.

162 Paul Joachimsen, "Loci Communes: Eine Untersuchung zur Geistesgeschichte des Humanismus und der Reformation," *Luther-Jahrbuch* 8 (1926), 27–97; Cesare Vasoli, "Loci Communes and the Rhetorical and Dialectical Traditions," in J. C. McLelland (ed.), *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform* (Wilfred Laurier University Press, Waterloo, ON, 1980), pp. 17–28. For the argument that Melanchthon actually subordinates both philosophy and theology to rhetoric, see Quirinius Breen, "The Subordination of Philosophy to Rhetoric in Melanchthon: A Study of his Reply to G. Pico della Mirandola," *ARG* 43 (1952), 13–28.

163 For the theological structure of the work, see the helpful study of Robert Kolb, "The Ordering of the *Loci Communes Theologici*: The Structuring of the Melanchthonian Dogmatic Tradition," *Concordia Journal* 23 (1997), 317–37.

Chapter 3 Late Medieval Theology and the Reformation

1 For some of the issues, see the excellent study of Michael Basse, "Theologiegeschichtsschreibung und Kontroverstheologie: Die Bedeutung der Scholastik

für die protestantische Kirchengeschichtsschreibung," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 107 (1996), 50–71. It should, of course, be noted that scholasticism came to be viewed with growing suspicion within Roman Catholic circles around the time of the Council of Trent: for an important contemporary defense of scholasticism that reveals much of the emerging hostility towards it; see Juan Belda Plans, "Domingo de Soto y la defensa de la teología escolástico en Trento," *Scripta Theologica* 27 (1995), 423–58.

2 Text as established by Johannes Schilling, "*Determinatio secunda almae facultatis theologiae Parisiensis super Apologiam Philippi Melanchthonis pro Luthero scriptam*," in *Lutheriana: Zum 500. Geburtstag Martin Luthers* (Archiv zur Weimarer Ausgabe 5, Bohlau, Cologne/Vienna, 1984), 351–75; see especially 372.27–31. Developments within the Paris faculty of theology over the period 1500–43 are of relevance to this study, but cannot be pursued here: see J. K. Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France: The Faculty of Theology of Paris, 1500–1543* (Brill, Leiden, 1985).

3 For general surveys of the literature, see William J. Courtenay, "Nominalism and Late Medieval Thought: A Bibliographical Essay," *Theological Studies* 33 (1972), 716–34; "Nominalism and Late Medieval Religion," in Charles Trinkaus with Heiko A. Oberman (eds.), *The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion* (Brill, Leiden, 1974), pp. 26–59; "Late Medieval Nominalism Revisited: 1972–1982," *Joumal of the History of Ideas* 44 (1983), 159–64; Joseph Koterski, "Philosophy and Religion: From the Thirteenth Century to the Twentieth Century,", in B. Davies (ed.), *Philosophy of Religion* (Cassell, London, 1998), pp. 12–21.

4 For the old view, long since abandoned, see Johann Heinrich Loewe, *Der Kampf zwischen dem Realismus und Nominalismus im Mittelalter: Sein Ursprung und sein Verlauf* (Kosmack & Neugebauer, Prague, 1876).

5 For example, see Neil W. Gilbert, "Ockham, Wyclif and the 'Via Moderna'," in A. Zimmerman (ed.), *Antiqui et Moderni: Traditionsbewusstsein and Fortschrittbewusstsein im späten Mittelalter* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1974), pp. 85–125; Zénon Kaluza, *Les querelles doctrinales à Paris: nominalistes et réalistes aux confins du XIVe et du XVe siècles* (Lubrina, Bergamo, 1988); Dennis D. Martin, "The *Via Moderna*, Humanism and the Hermeneutics of Late Medieval Monastic Life," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 51 (1990), 179–97.

6 For this view of fourteenth-century "nominalism", see Konstantin Michalski, "Les courant philosophiques à Oxford et à Paris pendant le XIVe siècle," *Bulletin International de l'Academie Polonaise des Sciences et des Lettres* (Academie Polonaise des Sciences et des Lettres, Cracow, 1921), pp. 59–88. The same view may be found more recently in David Knowles, *The Evolution of Medieval Thought* (Longman, London, 1970).

7 Paul Vignaux, article on "Nominalisme," in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (Paris, Letouzey et Ane, 1927–54), vol. II/1, cols. 717–84. Vignaux developed this approach further in his later monograph, *Nominalisme au XIVe siècle* (Institut d'études médiévales, Montreal, 1948).

8 Jean Jolivet, "Comparaison des théories du language chez Abélard et chez les nominalistes du XIVe siècle," in E. M. Buytaert (ed.), *Peter Abelard: Proceedings of*

the International Conference (Leuven University Press, Louvain, 1974), pp. 163–78; Martin Tweedale, *Abailard on Universals* (Rodopi, Amsterdam, 1976).

9 See the particularly important exposition of Stephen F. Brown, "A Modern Prologue to Ockham's Natural Philosophy," in *Sprache und Erkenntnis im Mittelalter* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1981), pp. 107–29. For reflections on its contemporary significance, see Jürgen Goldstein, *Nominalismus und Moderne: Zur Konstitution neuzeitlicher Subjektivität bei Hans Blumenberg und Wilhelm von Ockham* (Alber, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1998).

10 P. Boehner, "The Realistic Conceptualism of William Ockham," in E. M. Buytaert (ed.), *Collected Articles on Ockham* (Franciscan Institute, New York, 1958), pp. 156–74.

11 E. A. Moody, *The Logic of William of Ockham* (Russell & Russell, New York, 1965), pp. 37–8.

12 Cyrille Michon, *Nominalisme: la théorie de la signification d'Occam* (Vrin, Paris, 1994). For further reflections, see the important study of Elizabeth Karger, "Ockham's Misunderstood Theory of Intuitive and Abstractive Cognition," in P. V. Spade (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ockham* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1999), pp. 204–26.

13 See the seminal study of Erich Hochstetter, "Nominalismus?" *FcS* 9 (1949), 370–403.

14 Courtenay, "Nominalism and Late Medieval Religion," p. 52.

15 See the valuable study of Katherine H. Tuchau, "The Problem of the *species in medio* at Oxford in the Generation after Ockham," *Medieval Studies* 44 (1982), 394–443.

16 Ibid., pp. 404–32. Tuchau's comments should be supplemented by the more recent study of Fritz Hoffmann, "Der Wandel in der scholastischen Argumentation von 13, zum 14. Jahrhundert, aufgezeigt an zwei Beispielen: Robert Holcot und William (Johannes?) Crathorn (1330–1332 in Oxford)," in A. Speer (ed.), *Die Bibliotheca Amploniana: Ihre Bedeutung im Spannungsfeld von Aristotelismus, Nominalismus und Humanismus* (De Gruyter, Berlin, 1995), pp. 301–22.

17 Tuchau, "Problem of the *species in medio*," p. 443.

18 See the important study of Heinrich Schepers, "Holkot contra dicta Crathorn," *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 77 (1970), 320–54; 79 (1972), 106–36.

19 Gedeon Gál, "Adam of Wodeham's Question on the 'complexe significabile' as the Immediate Object of Scientific Knowledge," *FcS* 37 (1977), 66–102. This article solved the long-standing debate over the source of Gregory of Rimini's doctrine of the *complexe significabile*. On Wodeham, see William J. Courtenay, *Adam Wodeham: An Introduction to His Life and Writings* (Brill, Leiden, 1978).

20 Mario Del Fra, "La teoria dei 'significato totale' delle propositione nel pensiero di Gregorio da Rimini," *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia* 11 (1956), 287–311. More generally, see F. Hoffmann, "Der Satz als Zeichen der theologischen Aussage bei Holcot, Crathorn und Gregor von Rimini," in *Der Begriff der Repräsentatio im Mittelalter* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1971), pp. 296–313.

21 Volker Wendland, "Die Wissenschaftslehre Gregors von Rimini in der Diskussion," in H. A. Oberman (ed.), *Gregor von Rimini: Werk und Wirkung bis*

zur Reformation (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, 1981), pp. 241–300; Courtenay, "Late Medieval Nominalism Revisited," p. 163.

22 This is the view of Schepers, "Holkot contra dicta Crathorn," who regards Holcot as a conservative supporter of Ockham against the views of Crathorn.

23 The importance of the Jerónimo Pardo, part of the last great flowering of "nominalism" at the University of Paris in the final decade of the fifteenth century, has only recently been appreciated: see Paloma Pérez-Ilzarbe, *El significado de las proposiciones. Jerónimo Pardo († 1502) y las teorías medievales de la proposición* (Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona, 1999).

24 See Adolar Zurnkeller, *Hugolin von Orvieto und seine theologische Erkenntnislehre* (Augustinus Verlag, Würzburg, 1941); Mario Del Fra, "Linguaggio e conoscenza assertiva nel pensiero di Roberto Holkot," *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia* 11 (1956), 15–40; E. A. Moody, "A Quodlibetal Question of Robert Holkot O. P. on the Problem of Knowledge and of Belief," *Speculum* 39 (1964), 53–74; Willigis Eckermann, *Wort und Wirklichkeit: Das Sprachverständnis in der Theologie Gregors von Rimini und seine Weiterwirkung in der Augustinerschule* (Augustinus Verlag, Würzburg, 1978).

25 K. Smith, "Ockham's Influence on Gregory of Rimini's Natural Philosophy," in V. Syros, A. Kouris, and H. Kalokairinou (eds.), *Dialexeis: Akademaiko etos 1996–7* (Homilos Philosophias Panepistemiou Kyprou, Nicosia, 1999), pp. 107–42. For an analysis of Gregory's *Commentary on the Sentences*, see Pascale Bermon, "La *Lectura* sur les deux premiers livres des Sentences de Grégoire de Rimini O.E.S.A. (1300–1358)," in G. R. Evans (ed.), *Medieval Commentaries on Peter Lombard's Sentences* (2 vols, Brill, Leiden, 2001), vol. 1, pp. 267–85.

26 Manuel Santos-Noya, *Die Sünden- und Gnadenlehre des Gregor von Rimini* (Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, 1990). More generally, see Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2nd edn, 1986), pp. 166–79 for an analysis.

27 Heiko A. Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1963), pp. 196–206.

28 *WATr* 5.6419; reprinted in Heiko A. Oberman, *Werden und Wertung der Reformation* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1977), p. 425. For a detailed analysis of Luther's epistemology in the light of his late medieval context, see Graham White, *Luther as Nominalist: A Study of the Logical Methods used in Martin Luther's Disputations in the Light of their Medieval Background* (Luther Agricola Society, Helsinki, 1994).

29 See the biography of Joachim Camerarius, *De vita Philippi Melanchthonis*, ed. G. T. Strobel (Sumptibus Ioannes Iacobi Gebaueri, Halle, 1777), pp. 22–3.

30 Ruprecht Paqué, *Das Pariser Nominalistenstatut: Zur Entstehung des Realitätsbegriff der neuzeitlichen Naturwissenschaft (Occam, Buridan und Petrus Hispanicus, Nikolaus von Autrecourt und Gregor von Rimini)* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1970). On the social background to such thinkers, see William J. Courtenay, *Parisian Scholars in the Early Fourteenth Century: A Social Portrait* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999).

31 Gerhard Ritter, *Studien zur Spätscholastik I. Marsilius von Inghen und die okkamistische Schule in Deutschland* (Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Heidelberg, 1921); *Studien zur Spätscholastik II: Via antiqua und via moderna auf den deutschen*

Universitäten des XV. Jahrhunderts (Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Heidelberg, 1922); Maarten van Rhijn, "Wessel Gansfort te Heidelberg en de strijd tussen de 'via antiqua' en de 'via moderna'," in *Studien over Wessel Gansfort en zijn tijd* (Kemink en Zoon, Utrecht, 1933), pp. 23–37.

32 For the radical divergence between these figures on the issue of justification and predestination, see the classic study of Paul Vignaux, *Justification et prédestination au XIVe siècle: Duns Scot, Pierre d'Auriole, Guillaume d'Occam, Grégoire de Rimini* (Vrin, Paris, 1934). This work now requires correction at points: see, for example, James L. Halverson, *Peter Aureol on Predestination: A Challenge to Late Medieval Thought* (Brill, Leiden, 1998); Christopher Schabel, *Theology at Paris 1316–1345: Peter Auriol and the Problem of Divine Foreknowledge and Future Contingents* (Ashgate, Aldershot, 2000).

33 Oberman, *Werden und Wertung der Reformation*, p. 35.

34 On which see such studies as L. M. de Rijk, *Jean Buridan (c.1292–c.1360): Eerbiedig ondermijner van het aristotelisch substantie-denken* (Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Amsterdam, 1994); P. Souffrin and Alain Segonds, *Nicolas Oresme: Tradition et innovation chez un intellectuel du XIVe siecle* (Editions Les Belles Lettres, Paris, 1988); M. J. F. M. Hoenen and Paul J. J. M. Bakker, *Philosophie und Theologie des ausgehenden Mittelalters: Marsilius von Inghen und das Denken seiner Zeit* (Brill, Leiden, 2000); M. J. F. M. Hoenen, *Marsilius of Inghen: Divine Knowledge in Late Medieval Thought* (Brill, Leiden, 1993). The question of Jean Gerson's relationship to the *via moderna* has been the subject of much discussion: see Jan Pinborg, *Logik und Semantik im Mittelalter: Ein Überblick* (Frommann-Holzboog, Stuttgart, 1972), pp. 77–126.

35 For example, at Paris: see R. G. Villoslada, *La Universidad de Paris durante los estudios de Francisco de Vitoria O.P. (1507–1522)* (Universitas Gregoriana, Rome, 1938), p. 76.

36 For example, at Tübingen: see Rudolph von Roth (ed.), *Urkunden zur Geschichte der Universität Tübingen aus den Jahren 1476 bis 1550* (Scientia Verlag, Aalen, 1973), p. 264.

37 Ritter, *Studien zur Spätscholastik I*, p. 46.

38 Walther Friedensburg, *Urkundenbuch der Universität Wittenberg I (1502–1611)* (Selbstverlag der Historischen Kommission, Magdeburg, 1926), pp. 53, 56.

39 Ockham, *In II Sent.*, qq. 14–15 O.

40 M. Grabmann, *Der lateinische Averroismus des 13. Jahrhunderts und seine Stellung zur christlichen Weltanschauung* (Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie dedr Wissenshaften, Munich, 1931).

41 For further discussion of these significant themes, see Francis Oakley, *Omnipotence, Covenant and Order: An Excursion in the History of Ideas from Abelard to Leibniz* (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY, 1984); Gijsbert van den Brink, *Almighty God: A Study of the Doctrine of Divine Omnipotence* (Kok, Kampen, 1993).

42 For an introduction, see McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 119–28. The following statement of Ockham is definitive, *Quodl.* 6 q. 1; *Opera Theologica* 9.585.114–586.24:

> *Dico quod quaedam potest Deus facere de potentia ordinata et aliqua de potentia absoluta. Haec distinctio non est sic intelligenda quod in Deo sint realiter duae*

potentiae quarum una sit ordinata et alia absoluta, quia unica est potentia in Deo ad extra, quae omni modo est ipse Deus. Nec sic est intelligenda quod aliqua potest Deus ordinate facere et aliqua potest absolute et non ordinate, quia Deus nihil potest facere inordinate. Sed est intelligenda quod "posse aliquid" quandoque accipitur secundum leges ordinatas et institutas a Deo; et illa dicitur Deus posse facere de potentia ordinata.

43 For a historical analysis, see McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 100–9, 145–54.

44 Ibid., pp. 149–50. For an extended discussion, see Vignaux, *Justification et prédestination au XIVe siècle*, pp. 43–95.

45 McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, 150–1; see Vignaux, *Justification et prédestination au XIVe siècle*, pp. 97–140, especially pp. 99–118.

46 See William J. Courtenay, *Covenant and Causality in Medieval Thought: Studies in Philosophy, Theology and Economic Practice* (Variorum, London, 1984).

47 Werner Dettloff, *Die Lehre von der Acceptatio Divina bei Johannes Duns Skotus* (Dietrich Coelde Verlag, Werl, 1954); *Die Entwicklung der Akzeptations- und Verdienstlehre von Duns Skotus bis Luther* (Achendorff, Münster, 1963).

48 The best study of this remains Berndt Hamm, *Promissio, pactum, ordinatio: Freiheit und Selbstbindung Gottes in der scholastischen Gnadenlehre* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1977).

49 See the useful comments in Markus Wriedt, *Gnade und Erwählung: Eine Untersuchung zu Johann von Staupitz und Martin Luther* (von Zabern, Mainz, 1991). It is interesting to compare Luther with Karl Barth at this point: Bertold Klappert, *Promissio und Bund: Gesetz und Evangelium bei Luther und Barth* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1976).

50 Holcot, *Lectiones super libros sapientiae*, lect. 145B

Necessitas coactionis nullo modo cadit in deo, necessitas vero infallibilitatis cadit in deo ex promisso suo et pacto sive lege statuta, et haec non est necessitas absoluta sed necessitas consequentiae . . . Concedendo quod ex misericordia et gratia sua pro tanto, quia talem legem misericordiam statuit et observat, sed statuta lege necessario dat gratiam necessitate consequentiae.

Note the emphasis upon the concepts of *promissio* and *pactum*.

51 Biel, *In II Sent.* dist. xxvii q. unica a. 2 concl. 1 G "*Nam licet deus nullius debitor esse possit ex natura rei, potest tamen se facere debitorem nostrum ex sua libera voluntate nobis promittendo pro talibus actibus tantum praemium.*" See further Heiko A. Oberman, "Wir sint pettler. Hoc est verum. Bund und Gnade in der Theologie des Mittelalters und Reformation," *ZKG* 78 (1967), 232–52; Martin Greschat, "Der Bundesgedanke in der Theologie des späten Mittelalters," *ZKG* 81 (1970), 44–63; William J. Courtenay, "Covenant and Causality in Pierre d'Ailly," *Speculum* 46 (1971), 94–119; Hamm, *Promissio, Pactum, Ordinatio*, pp. 355–90.

52 See James S. Preus, *From Shadow to Promise: Old Testament Interpretation from Augustine to the Young Luther* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1969). More generally, see Rolf Rendtorff, *The Covenant Formula: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation* (T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1998).

53 See, e.g., the comments of Bugenhagen: ". . . *insipienter errent, qui gratiam dei, de qua loquuntur scripturae per quam solam salvamur, describunt esse habitum in hominem sive qualitatem, cum sit favor potius in deo bene volente nobis ut filiis*"; cited by Hans H. Holfelder, *Solus Christus: Die Ausbildung von Bugenhagens Rechtfertigungslehre in der Paulusauslegung (1524/25) und ihre Bedeutung* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1981), p. 24. For the development of the idea of grace in the Middle Ages, see McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 100–9; Zoltan Alszeghy, *Nova creatura: La nozione della grazia nei commentari medievali di S. Paolo* (Universitas Gregorianae, Rome, 1956); Johann Auer, *Die Entwicklung der Gnadenlehre in der Hochscholastik* (Herder, Freiburg, 1951).

54 See Alister E. McGrath, "Some Observations concerning the Soteriology of the *Schola Moderna*," *RThAM* 52 (1985), 182–93.

55 Biel, *In II Sent*. dist. xxvii q. unica a. 3 dub. 4 O.

56 Oberman, *Harvest of Medieval Theology*, pp. 108–11.

57 McGrath, "Some Observations," p. 184; "*Homo Assumptus?* A Study in the Christology of the *Via Moderna*, with Particular Reference to William of Ockham," *EThL* 60 (1985), 283–97, especially pp. 285–7. For the background to Ockham's thought in Aquinas and Scotus, see Richard A. Cross, *The Metaphysics of Incarnation: Thomas Aquinas to Duns Scotus* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002).

58 Oberman, *Harvest of Medieval Theology*, pp. 112–19.

59 J. Wayne Baker, *Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenant: The Other Reformed Tradition* (Ohio University Press, Athens, OH, 1980), xi–xxvi; 1–25, has some useful comments, although his material is marred by a misunderstanding of late medieval thought (e.g., pp. 23–5). For a refutation of the (here, as elsewhere) alleged "semi-Pelagianism" of the *via moderna*, see A. E. McGrath, "The Anti-Pelagian Structure of 'Nominalist' Doctrines of Justification," *EThL* 57 (1981), 107–19.

60 McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 114–16.

61 More strictly, *iustitia secundum praesuppositionem divinae ordinationis*, rather than *iustitia secundum absolutam aequaiitatem*: see *Summa Theologiae*, IaIIae q. 114 a. 1 ad 3um; McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, vol. 1, 114.

62 Scotus, *Opus Oxoniense* III dist. xix q. 1 n. 7.

63 Vignaux, *Justification et prédestination*, pp. 127–40.

64 Erwin Iserloh, *Gnade und Eucharistie in der philosophischen Theologie des Wilhelm von Ockhams* (Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1956), pp. 64–7.

65 Biel, *Canonis Missae expositio*, 23E:

> *Nihil fieri dignum est nisi be tua benignitate et misericordia voluntate dignum iudiacre volueris, neque enim quia bonum aut iustum est aliquid, ipsum Deus vult, sed quia Deus vult, ideo bonum est et iustum. Voluntas nanque divina non ex nostra bonitate, sed ex divina voluntate bonitas nostra pendet, nec aliquid bonum nisi quia a Deo sic acceptum.*

66 McGrath, "Some Observations," pp. 191–2.

67 A. V. Müller, *Luthers theologische Quellen: Seine Verteidigung gegen Denifle und Grisar* (Topelmann, Giessen, 1912).

68 See Karl Werner, *Die Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters III: Der Augustinismus in der Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters* (Bohlau, Vienna, 1883); Carl Stange, "Über

Luthers Beziehungen zur Theologie seines Ordens," *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 11 (1900), 574–85; Stange, "Luther über Gregor von Rimini," *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 13 (1902), 721–7.

69 Eduard Stakemeier, *Der Kampf um Augustin: Augustinus und die Augustiner auf dem Tridentinum* (Bonifacius Druckerei, Paderborn, 1937).

70 Ibid., pp. 21–2.

71 See Hubert Jedin's review of Stakemeier, *Der Kampf um Augustin*, in *Theologische Revue* 37 (1938), 425–30.

72 McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 253–5.

73 David C. Steinmetz, *Luther and Staupitz: An Essay on the Intellectual Origins of the Protestant Reformation* (Duke University Press, Durham, NC, 1980), 13–15, distinguishes five senses in which the term "Augustinian" has been used by medieval historians, and draws attention to the confusion that has resulted.

74 By "Augustine," of course, we mean "Augustine of Hippo" and not "Augustine of Rome," Agostino Favaroni, a noted fifteenth-century theologian of the Augustinian Order: see Salesius Friemel, *Die theologische Prinzipienlehre des Augustinus Favaroni von Rom, O.E.S.A. (1443)* (Augustinus Verlag, Würzburg, 1950).

75 Damasus Trapp, "Augustinian Theology of the Fourteenth Century: Notes on Editions, Marginalia, Opinions and Book-Lore," *Augustiniana* 6 (1956), 147–265.

76 Adolar Zumkeller, "Die Augustinerschule des Mittelalters: Vetreter und philosophisch-theologische Lehre," *Analecta Augustiniana* 27 (1964), 167–262. On Giles of Rome, see J. Beumer, "Augustinismus und Thomismus in der theologischen Prinzipienlehre des Aegidius Romanus," *Scholastik* 32 (1957), 542–60. Beumer argues convincingly that Giles is essentially a student of Augustine with occasional Thomist tendencies, rather than a Thomist with a particular interest in Augustine. A good example of this divergence from Aquinas can be seen when Giles critiques the Thomist notion that the incorruptibility of celestial bodies derives from the peculiar nature of their matter: Silvia Donati, "La dottrina di Egidio Romano sulla materia dei corpi celesti. Discussioni sulla natura dei corpi celesti alla fine del tredicesimo secolo," *Medioevo* 12 (1986), 229–80. See more generally Giorgio Pini, "La dottrina della creazione e la ricezione delle opere di Tommaso d'Aquino nelle Quaestiones de esse et essentia (qq. 1–7) di Egidio Romano," *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 3 (1992), 271–304.

77 A. E. McGrath, "'Augustinianism'? A Critical Assessment of the So-called 'Medieval Augustinian Tradition' on Justification," *Augustiniana* 31 (1981), 247–67; *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 172–9.

78 Some later theologians, such as Johannes von Retz, retained the older view through their fidelity to the teachings of Thomas of Strasbourg.

79 Martin Schüler, *Prädestination, Sünde und Freiheit bei Gregor von Rimini* (Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1934); Vignaux, *Justification et prédestination*, pp. 141–75; Adolar Zumkeller, *Dionysius de Montina: Ein neuentdeckter Augustinertheologe des Spätmittelalters* (Augustinus Verlag, Würzburg, 1948); "Hugolin von Orvieto über Prädestination, Rechtfertigung und Verdienst," *Augustiniana* 4 (1954), 109–56, 5 (1955), 5–51.

80 McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 145–54, 172, 179.
81 Heiko A. Oberman, "Tuus sum, salvum me fac: Augustinreveil zwischen Renaissance und Reformation," in C. P. Mayer and W. Eckermann (eds.), *Scientia Augustiniana: Studien über Augustinus, den Augustinismus und den Augustinerorden* (Augustinus Verlag, Würzburg, 1975), pp. 349–94.
82 Heiko A. Oberman, *Archbishop Thomas Bradwardine: A Fourteenth Century Augustinian* (Kemink & Zoon, Utrecht, 1957); Gordon Leff, *Bradwardine and the Pelagians: A Study of His "De Causa Dei" and its Opponents* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1957), pp. 23–124. For a more recent study of the *modernus* Thomas Buckingham's role in this controversy, see Jean-François Genest, *Prédétermination et liberté créée à Oxford au XIVe siècle: Buckingham contre Bradwardine* (Vrin, Paris, 1992).
83 *De causa Dei* (London, 1618), i, 35; 311C.
84 McGrath, "Augustinianism?" pp. 254–5.
85 Thus J. F. Laun, "Thomas von Bradwardine, der Schüler Augustins und Lehrer Wiclifs," *ZKG* 47 (1928), 333–56.
86 *WA* 7.146.5–11 (1520). Cf. the earlier statement (1518), "*Liberum arbitrium post peccatum res est de solo titulo*" (*WA* 1.359.32), which may – but need not – reflect Wycliffe's dictum.
87 Schüler, *Gregor von Rimini*, p. 31; Oberman, *Werden und Wertung*, p. 89.
88 *In II Sent.* dist. xxix q. 1 a. 1. The name "Bradwardine" is found in the margins of two manuscripts: Paris Bib. Nat. lat 15891 and Mazarine 914. It is not clear whether the term *modernus* here simply means "recent" or whether it has deeper connotations.
89 See Manfred Schulze, "'Via Gregorii' in Forschung und Quellen," in H. A. Oberman (ed.), *Gregor von Rimini: Wirk und Wirkung bis zur Reformation* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, 1981), pp. 1–126, especially pp. 13–22, 25–75.
90 Trapp warns us that, when dealing with theologians of the Augustinian Order, one should speak "cautiously of attitudes, not of schools" (Trapp, "Augustinian Theology," p. 150). Since then, the case for speaking of a "school" has been strengthened: see Schulze, "Via Gregorii," pp. 25–63.
91 Schulze, "Via Gregorii," pp. 64–75.
92 Villoslada, *Universidad de Paris*, p. 118.
93 Walter Köhler, *Huldrych Zwinglis Bibliothek* (Kommissionsverlag Beer, Zurich, 1921), pp. 10–11, nn. 74, 290. Cf. J. F. Gerhard Goeters, "Zwinglis Werdegang als Erasmianer," in M. Greschat and J. F. G. Goeters (eds.), *Reformation und Humanismus: Robert Stupperich zum 65. Geburtstag* (Luther Verlag, Witten, 1969), pp. 255–71, especially pp. 256–61.
94 *CR* (Zwingli) 7.3. The early years of the university of Basle, from 1460–4, were marked by a confrontation between the *via moderna* and *via antiqua:* see Astrik L. Gabriel, "'Via Antiqua' and 'Via Moderna' and the Migration of Paris Students and Masters to the German Universities in the Fifteenth Century,", in A. Zimmermann (ed.), *Antiqui und Modemi: Traditionsbewußtsein und Fortschrittbewußtsein im späten Mittelalter* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, 1974), pp. 439–83, 474; Oberman, *Werden und Wertung der Reformation*, pp. 39–40.

95 Daniel Bolliger, "Infiniti Contemplatio: Grundzüge der Scotus- und Scotismusrezeption im Werk Huldrych Zwinglis." Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Zurich, 2000, pp. 239–331.

96 G. Berthoud, *Antoine Marcourt, réformateur et pamphlétaire du "Livre de Marchans" aux placards de 1534* (Droz, Geneva, 1973), pp. 157–222. For the text of these celebrated placards, see pp. 287–9.

97 As one of his early biographers emphasizes, it was a close escape: *CR* (Calvin) 21.56.

98 Most recently, see Richard Stauffer, "Calvin," in Menna Prestwich (ed.), *International Calvinism 1541–1715* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1985), pp. 15–38, see p. 16. See also the authoritative study of François Wendel, *Calvin: The Origins and Developmmt of his Religious Thought* (Collins, London, 1974), pp. 17–18.

99 On this biography, see D. Ménager, "Théodore de Bèze biographe de Calvin," *BHR* 45 (1983), 231–55.

100 *CR* (Calvin) 21.36. 89, 21.54.

101 Ibid., 21.121 ". . . *in Gymnasio Marchiano Mathurinum Corderium.*"

102 Ibid., 13.525.

103 See Charles Emile Delormeau, *Un maître de Calvin: Mathurin Cordier, l'un des créateurs de l'enseignment secondaire moderne* (Messeiller, Neuchatel, 1976), pp. 24–9.

104 Thus note the comments of J. Quicherot, *Histoire de Sainte Barbe* (3 vols, Hachette, Paris, 1860–4), vol. 1, p. 206.

105 A list of such colleges may be found in Cordier's *Colloquia* (February 6, 1564), reprinted Delormeau, *Un maître de Calvin*, pp. 122–6.

106 Emile Doumergue, *Jean Calvin, les hommes et les choses de son temps* (7 vols, Bridel, Lausanne, 1899–1917), vol. I, p. 46.

107 Jacques Desmay, "Remarques sur la vie de Jean Calvin, tirées des registres de Noyon, 'ville de sa naissance'," in L. Cimber (Lafait) and F. Danjou (eds.), *Archives curieuses de l'histoire de France depuis Louis XI jusqu'à Louis XVIII* (15 vols, Beauvais, Paris, 1834–7), vol. 5, pp. 387–98.

108 See Charles Thurot, *De l'organisation de l'enseignement dans l'université de Paris au moyen âge* (Dezobry Magdeleine, Paris/Besançon, 1850), p. 94; G. Dupont-Ferrier, "La faculté des arts dans l'université de Paris et son influence civilisatrice," in L. Halphen (ed.), *Aspects de l'université de Paris* (Michel, Paris, 1949), pp. 63–80, see pp. 70–1.

109 For example, see Desmay, "Remarques," p. 388; Beza, *CR* (Calvin) 21.121; Alexandre Ganoczy, *Le jeune Calvin: génèse et évolution de sa vocation réformatrice* (Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1966), p. 34.

110 *CR* (Calvin) 31.22. Cf. Beza's statement, "*son coeur tendoit entierement à la Theologie*": *CR* (Calvin) 21.29.

111 Ganoczy, *Le jeune Calvin*, pp. 39, 186.

112 See, e.g., W. F. Dankbaar, *Calvin: Sein Weg und Werk* (Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen, 1959), p. 26.

113 Colladon refers us to two uninteresting Spaniards at *CR* (Calvin) 21.54, while Beza clearly associates Calvin's dialectical abilities with a Spanish teacher, *CR* (Calvin) 21.121: "*Translatus deinde in Gymnasium ab Acuto Monte cognominatum*

Hispanum habuit doctorem non indoctum: a quo exculto ipsius ingenio, quod ei iam tumerat acerrimum, ita profecit . . . ad dialectices et aliarum quas vocant artium studium promoveretur."

114 Pierre Feret, *La faculté de théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres* (7 vols, Picard, Paris, 1900–10), vol. 2, p. 66.

115 Paqué, *Das Pariser Nominalistenstatut*, pp. 8–12. *Mores* here is to be understood as in *mos gallicus* or *mos italicus* – that is, scholarly conventions and habits, rather than personal morals.

116 C. E. du Boulay, *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis* (6 vols, Franciscus Noel, Paris, 1665–75), vol. 4, pp. 273–4.

117 For the impact of this development, see Alan E. Bernstein, *Pierre d'Ailly and the Blanchard Affair: University and Chancellor of Paris at the Beginning of the Great Schism* (Brill, Leiden, 1978). More generally, see L. Salembier, *Le Cardinal Pierre d'Ailly* (Georges Frère, Tourçoing, 1932). For his epistemology, see B. Meiler, *Studien zur Erkenntnislehre des Peter von Ailly* (Herder, Freiburg, 1954).

118 Villoslada, *Universidad de Paris*, pp. 87, 106–26.

119 Erasmus, *Opera Omnia*, vol. 6, 962D, in which Erasmus illustrates the term "*vaniloquium*" (1 Timothy 1.13) with reference to some of the questions troubling the *théologastres* of the *via moderna*.

120 *Opera Omnia*, vol. 6, 927B: "*An possit ex facta facere infectum: ac per hoc ex meretrice facere virginem.*"

121 See the valuable study of William J. Courtenay, "John of Mirecourt and Gregory of Rimini on whether God can undo the past," *RThAM* 39 (1972), 244–56, 40 (1973), 147–74. On the related question of future contingents, see Léon Baudry, *La querelle des futurs contingents, Louvain 1465–1475* (Vrin, Paris, 1950); Gordon Leff, *William of Ockham* (Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1977), pp. 447–54.

122 *Opera Omnia,* vol. 6,927C: "*An quaelibet persona divina possit quamlibet naturam assumere, quomodo Verbum humanam assumpsit . . . An haec propositio, Deus est scarabeus, aut cucurbita, tam possibilis sit, quam haec, Deus est homo.*" Similar derisory sentiments are expressed to John Colet in a letter of 1499, with his Paris experiences fresh in his mind: *Opus Epistolarum,* P. S. and H. M. Allen (eds.), (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1906–47), vol. 1, no. 108, pp. 246–9, especially lines 41–4.

123 *Institutio* II.xii.5: "*Eosque erupit quorundam vesania dum praepostere acuti videri appetunt, ut quaererent an naturam asini assumeri potuerit Dei filius.*" The question is raised in this form by William of Ockham and others: *In III Sent.* q. i G.

124 See McGrath, "*Homo Assumptus?*" for discussion. For a fuller analysis of some of the issues, see Richard A. Cross, *The Metaphysics of Incarnation: Thomas Aquinas to Duns Scotus* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002).

125 Major, *In III Sent.* dist. ii q. 2 (Paris, 1528), fol. vi^{ra}.

126 Karl Reuter, *Das Grundverständnis der Theologie Calvins* (Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen, 1963), pp. 20–1. More recently, Reuter has defended and developed this thesis: *Vom Scholaren bis zum jungen Reformator: Studien zum Werdegang Johannes Calvins* (Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen, 1981). Cf. Alister E. McGrath, "John Calvin and Late Medieval Thought: A Study in Late Medieval Influences upon Calvin's Theological Development," *ARG* 77 (1986), 58–78.

127 Reuter, *Grundverständnis der Theologie Calvins*, p. 21.
128 See, e.g., the hints of such a hypothesis in Luchesius Smits, *Saint Augustin dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin I: étude de critique littéraire* (Van Gorcum, Assen, 1956), p. 14; Dankbaar, *Calvin: sein Weg und sein Werk*, p. 5.
129 Reuter, *Grundverständnis der Theologie Calvins*, pp. 32–4, 154.
130 For example, see Kilian McDonnell, *John Calvin, the Church and the Eucharist* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1967), pp. 7–22.
131 Thomas F. Torrance, "La philosophie et la théologie de Jean Mair ou Major (1469–1550)," *Archives de philosophie* 32 (1969), 531–47, 33 (1970), 261–94; "Intuitive and Abstractive Knowledge from Duns Scotus to John Calvin," in *De doctrina Ioannis Duns Scoti: Acta tertii Congressus Scotistici Internationalis* (Cura Commissionis Scotisticae, Rome, 1972), pp. 291–305.
132 Ganoczy, *Le jeune Calvin*, pp. 189–92.
133 Ganoczy, *Le jeune Calvin*, pp. 179–85. For a detailed breakdown of Calvin's use of Peter Lombard and Gratian in the 1536, 1539, 1543, and 1559 editions, see Smits, *Saint Augustin dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin*, p. 210. Of the 40 references to Peter Lombard and Gratian, only one relates to the theology of grace. Note in particular the virtual elimination of all sacramental references in the 1539 edition, with a new interest in the theology of grace: of the 10 references to these two theologians, eight now relate to the theology of grace. Some important additional points of relevance here are made by A. N. S. Lane, *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers* (T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1999), pp. 22–5.
134 Reuter, *Vom Scholaren bis zum jungen Reformator*, pp. 6–12.
135 Louis Goumaz, *Le doctrine de la salut d'après Les commentaires de Jean Calvin sur le Noveau Testament* (Cherix, Noyon, 1917), p. 92.
136 Villoslada, *Universidad de Paris*, p. 76.
137 Ibid., 118.
138 See, e.g., Ganoczy, *Le jeune Calvin*, pp. 196–200; Reuter, *Vom Scholaren bis zum jungen Reformator*, pp. 6–7.
139 H. A. Oberman, "*Initia Calvini*: The Matrix of Calvin's Reformation," in W. H. Neuser (ed.), *Calvinus Sacrae Scripturae Professor* (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, 1994), pp. 117–27.
140 Thus the 1517 *Disputatio contra scholasticam theologiam* is now recognized to be aimed directly at Gabriel Biel, rather than at "scholastic theology" in general: see Leif Grane, *Contra Gabrielem: Luthers Auseinandersetzung mit Gabriel Biel in der Disputatio contra scholasticam theologiam 1517* (Gyldendal, Copenhagen, 1962).
141 On the catechisms, see H. Robinson-Hammerstein, *The Transmission of Ideas in the Lutheran Reformation* (Irish Academic Press, Blackrock, Ireland, 1989); T. F. Torrance, *The School of Faith: The Catechisms of the Reformed Church* (Clarke, London, 1959).
142 See the important essay of Jacques Courvoisier, *De la Réforme au Protestantisme: essai d'ecclésiologie réformée* (Beauchesne, Paris, 1977), pp. 65–100.
143 See Fraenkel, *Testimonia Patrum: The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon*, for details of this method.
144 Ganoczy, *Le jeune Calvin*, p. 179. See further M. Reulos, "Le Décret de Gratian chez les humanistes, les Gallicans et les réformés français du XVIe siècle," *Studia*

Gratiana 2 (1954), 692–6. An interesting observation, of obvious relevance here, is the reluctance of many sixteenth-century writers to identify contemporary sources in the first place: see the points made by G. Mattingly, "International Diplomacy and International Law," in R. B. Wernham (ed.), *New Cambridge Modern History III: The Counter Reformation and the Price Revolution 1558–1610* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1968), pp. 168–9.

145 Reuter, *Grundverständnis der Theologie Calvins*, p. 21.

146 See McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 109–19, 163–78.

147 Scotus, *Opus Oxoniense* III dist. xix q. 1 n. 7. See the discussion earlier in the present chapter.

148 *Responsio ad aliquot Lailii Socini Senensis quaestiones*: *CR* (Calvin) 10a.160–5. The 1554 edition of the *Institutio* gives a purely cursory analysis of the question (vii, 18: *CR* 1.523–4).

149 The replies are incorporated into the 1559 *Institutio* at the following points: II.xvii.I-5; III.ii.II-12.

150 *Institutio* II.xvii.1.

151 Alexander Gordon, "The Sozzini and their School," *Theological Review* 16 (1879), 293–322.

152 Reuter, *Grundverständnis der Theologie Calvins*, p. 21.

153 Major, *In I Sent.*, praefatio (Paris, 1530).

154 As van Ravenswaay points out, in any case arts students were not permitted to attend theology lectures: J. Marius Lange van Ravenswaay, *Augustinus totus noster: Das Augustinverständnis bei Johannes Calvin* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1990). This work merits close reading.

155 A copy of this work (though not necessarily Calvin's personal copy) was included in the library of the Genevan Academy in 1572: see Alexandre Ganoczy, *La bibliothèque de l'Academie de Calvin* (Droz, Geneva, 1969), pp. 102–5.

156 The chronology is disputed: see Philip McNair, *Peter Martyr in Italy: An Anatomy of Apostasy* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1967), pp. 78–82. For reflections on Vermigli's theological development, see Frank A. James, *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Predestination: The Augustinian Inheritance of an Italian Reformer* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1998), pp. 91–105.

157 McNair, *Peter Martyr*, pp. 100–6, especially p. 106 n. 3. On the related issue of Italian reformers in relation to humanism, see John Tedeschi, "The Cultural Contributions of Italian Protestant Reformers in the Late Renaissance," *Italica* 64 (1987), 19–61.

158 McNair, *Peter Martyr*, p. 94.

159 Cited McNair, *Peter Martyr*, p. 106.

160 On the text, see Bermon, "La *Lectura* sur les deux premiers livres des Sentences de Grégoire de Rimini O.E.S.A. (1300–1358)."

161 See John Patrick Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace* (Brill, Leiden, 1976), pp. 125–9.

162 For some useful reflections, see James, *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Predestination*, pp. 106–50.

163 On Zanchi in this respect, see Emanuele Fiume, "*Decretum Dei, solatium ineffabile*: il contributo di Girolamo Zanchi (1516–1590) alla dottrina della doppia

predestinazione e della perseveranza dei credenti," *Bollettino della Societa di Studi Valdesi* 114 (1997), 67–78. It has recently been suggested that Zanchi is essentially Thomist in his doctrine of God: Willem van't Spijker, "Thomism in Zanchi's Doctrine of God," in Willem J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker (eds.), *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise* (Baker, Grand Rapids, MI, 2001), pp. 121–39. This seems to me to rest on a failure to distinguish the respective ideas of Thomas Aquinas and Gregory of Rimini.

164 A point stressed by Heiko A. Oberman, "Headwaters of the Reformation."

165 Stange, "Über Luthers Beziehung zur Theologie seines Ordens," p. 578, where it is argued that Jerome Dungersheim's statement "*Egydius Rhomanus ordinis heremitarum s. Augustini, quem et Luther professus est*" implies that Luther vowed canonical obedience to the teachings of Giles of Rome.

166 Heinrich Hermelink, *Die theologische Fakultät in Tübingen vor der Reformation 1477–1534* (Paul Siebeck, Tübingen, 1906), p. 95 n. 1, where it is pointed out that Dungersheim was merely noting that Giles of Rome and Luther both belonged to the same monastic order (in other words, the antecedent to *quem* is *ordo*, rather than *Egydius Rhomanus*).

167 Oberman, "Headwaters of the Reformation," p. 82.

168 Hermelink, *Die theologische Fakultät*, pp. 95–6. Cf. Gabriel, "'Via antiqua' and 'via moderna'," p. 443. On Vienna, see Michael H. Shank, *"Unless you believe, you shall not understand": Logic, University, and Society in Late Medieval Vienna* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1988). On Cologne, see the exhaustive study of Götz-Rüdiger Tewes, *Die Bursen der Kölner Artisten-Fakultät bis zur Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Bohlau, Cologne, 1993), which distinguishes two *viae*, but three groups within these *viae*.

169 Wolfgang Urban, "Die 'via moderna' an der Universität Erfurt am Vorabend der Reformation," in H. A. Oberman (ed.), *Gregor von Rimini: Werk und Wirkung bis zur Reformation* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, 1981), pp. 311–30.

170 E. Hildebrand, "Bartholomäus Arnoldi von Usingen: Ein Lehrer Luthers an der Universität Erfurt," *Nassauische Annalen* 94 (1983), 327–34.

171 Oberman, *Harvest of Medieval Theology*, pp. 178–81.

172 For background material, see Nicolaus Paulus, *Der Augustiner Bartholomäus von Usingen, Luthers Lehrer und Gegner* (Herder, Freiburg, 1893); Nikolaus Härung, *Die Theologie des Erfurter Augustiner-Eremiten Bartholomäus von Usingen* (Schmitt, Limburg, 1939); Gustav Plitt, *Jodocus Trutfetter von Eisenach der Lehrer Luthers in seinem Wirken geschildert* (Erlangen, 1876).

173 Urban, "'Via moderna' an der Universität Erfurt," pp. 315–19.

174 Josef Pilvousek, "Jodocus Trutfetter (1460–1519) und der Erfurter Nominalismus," in D. von der Pforden (ed.), *Große Denker Erfurts und der Erfurter Universität* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 2002), pp. 96–117.

175 See the careful study of Leif Grane, "Gregor von Rimini und Luthers Leipziger Disputation," *Studia Theologica* 22 (1968), 29–49.

176 On Scheurl, see Wilhelm Graf, *Doktor Christoph Scheurl von Nürnberg* (Gerstenberg, Hildesheim, 1972). For his reforming views, as encountered a few years later at Nuremberg, see Gunter Zimmermann, "Das Nürnberger Religionsgespräch von 1525," *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg* 71 (1984), 129–48.

177 For example, those of Karlstadt and Amsdorf: Friedensburg, *Urkundenbuch der Universität Wittenberg*, p. 15.

178 Andreas Meinhardi, *Dialogus illustrate ac augustissime urbis Albiorenae vulgo Wittenberg dicte* (Leipzig, 1508), chapter 15 "*Reinhard: Cuius opinio verior, Divi Thome an subtilissime domini Scoti? Meinhard: Uterque fundatas habe rationes.*" I owe this reference to Dr Martin Treu (Halle).

179 F. W. Kampschulte, *Die Universität Erfurt in ihrem Verhältnis zu dem Humanismus und der Reformation I: Der Humanismus* (Lintz, Trier, 1858), pp. 43–5.

180 *Statuta* cap. 3, 5; Friedensburg, *Urkundenbuch der Universität Wittenberg*, pp. 53, 56.

181 Oberman, "Headwaters of the Reformation." But see note 191 below.

182 See, e.g., Karl Bauer, *Die Wittenberger Universitätstheologie und die Anfänge der Deutschen Refomlation* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1928), p. 9, n. 4; Franz Ehrle, *Der Sentenzenkommentar Peters von Candia, des Pisaner Papstes Alexanders V* (Aschendorff, Münster, 1925), p. 233.

183 Ritter, *Studien zur Spätscholastik I*, p. 46.

184 Ibid., pp. 11 n. 4, 38, n. 3.

185 Schulze, "Via Gregorii" in Forschung und Quellen", pp. 84–100.

186 Villoslada, *Universidad de Paris*, p. 76. See also Tewes, *Die Bursen der Kölner Artisten-Fakultät bis zur Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts.*

187 Villoslada, *Universidad de Paris*, p. 118.

188 The earlier manuscript may be found in Theodor Muther, *Die Wittenberger Universität- und Fakultätsstatuten von Jahre MDVIII* (Buchhandlung des Weisenhauses, Halle, 1867), pp. 41, 45. While Freidensburg's edition is to be preferred, the importance of the manuscript tradition at this critical juncture can hardly be overlooked.

189 *Christoph Scheurls Briefbuch: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Reformation und ihre Zeit*, F. von Soden and J. K. F. Knaake (eds.), (2 vols, Gropius'sche Buchhandlung, Potsdam, 1867–72), vol. I, no. 80. pp. 123–5. The term *modernus* was not, it should be noted, generally used in the sense of "a temporally recent writer" (the term *recentior* generally being used for this purpose), but was a technical term for the "postrealist" or "nonrealist" school of thought.

190 For a careful study of Luther's philosophical nominalism, see Graham White, *Luther as Nominalist: A Study of the Logical Methods used in Martin Luther's Disputations in the Light of their Medieval Background* (Luther Agricola Society, Helsinki, 1994). These observations reinforce our conclusions that, in the first place, Luther was a "nominalist" in one significant sense of the term, and in the second, that this has no bearing on his soteriology – the issue on which the Lutheran Reformation may be argued to have begun.

191 Oberman, *Werden und Wertung der Reformation*, p. 434 contains a reference to the *via Gregorii*, not noted in his index, which concedes the identity of *via Gregorii* and *via moderna*: "Die in Heidelberg vertretene Lehrrichtung der *via moderna* wird als *via Marsilii* bezeichnet, wie 1508 in Wittenberg, wo im Anschluß an Gregor von Rimini die *via moderna* als *via Gregorii* Eingang in die Statuten findet." This highly significant revision is not reflected in his discussion of the *via Gregorii* earlier in the work: pp. 91, 131 n. 172.

192 Adolar Zumkeller, *Johannes von Staupitz und seine christliche Heilslehre* (Augustinus Verlag, Würzburg, 1994). For further studies of Staupitz, see Rudolf K. Markwald and Franz Posset, *125 years of Staupitz Research (since 1867): An Annotated Bibliography of Studies on Johannes von Staupitz (c.1468–1524)* (Center for Reformation Research, Saint Louis, MO, 1995).

193 For a careful study, see Steinmetz, *Luther and Staupitz*, pp. 3–34.

194 See the discussion in Wriedt, *Gnade und Erwählung: Eine Untersuchung zu Johann von Staupitz und Martin Luther.*

195 For example, *WATr* 1.173 "*Ex Erasmo nihil habeo. Ich hab al mein ding von Doctor Staupitz.*"

196 Steinmetz, *Luther and Staupitz*, p. 141.

197 See Rudolf K. Markwald, *A Mystic's Passion: The Spirituality of Johannes von Staupitz in his 1520 Lenten Sermons* (Peter Lang, New York, 1990).

198 Ernst Wolf, *Staupitz und Luther: Ein Beitrag zur Theologie des Johannes von Staupitz und deren Bedeutung für Luthers theologischen Werdegang* (Heinsius Verlag, Leipzig, 1927), pp. 23–5; David C. Steinmetz, *Misericordia Dei: The Theology of Johannes von Staupitz in its Late Medieval Setting* (Brill, Leiden, 1968), pp. 22–8; *Luther and Staupitz*, pp. 27–31.

199 See the comments of Hubert Jedin on Stakemeier's intensely problematic attempt to relate Seripando to such theologians: *Theologische Revue* 37 (1938), 425–30.

200 McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 145–54.

201 See McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, pp. 84–5. The older study of Paul Vignaux, *Luther Commentateur des Sentences (Livre I, Distinction XVII)* (Vrin, Paris, 1935), is still useful.

202 *WA* 9.44.1–4. Cf. 9.42.35–43.6.

203 McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 65–7, 126–8.

204 For the origins and development of this axiom, see McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 83–91.

205 McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, pp. 85–92.

206 Ibid., p. 88, based on *WA* 4.261.32–9.

207 *WA* 4.262.4–7: "*Hinc recte dicunt doctores, quod homini facienti quod in se est deus infallibiliter dat gratiam et licet non de condigno sese possit ad gratiam praeparare, quia est incomparabilis, tamen bene de congruo proprer promissionem istam dei et pactum misericordia.*"

208 *WA* 3.289.1–5.

209 As noted, with important documentation, by Oswald Bayer, *Promissio: Geschichte der reformatorischen Wende in Luthers Theologie* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1971), pp. 129–32.

210 See McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, pp. 95–147, for an extended critical discussion of this central question of Luther scholarship.

211 *WA* 54.185.12–186.21; Latin original and parallel English translation in McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, pp. 95–8.

212 McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, pp. 100–19; *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 190–6.

213 A point that needs to be borne in mind when assessing the thesis that a breakthrough took place during the exposition of Psalm 70 (71), which is clearly not the case: McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, pp. 119–28.

214 The most important being *WA* 56.502.32–503.5. Cf. 56.382.26–7.

215 On the background to these two figures, see T. Salguiero, *La doctrine de Saint Augustin sur la grâce d'après la traité a Simplicien* (Faculdade de Letras de Coimbra, Porto, 1925); Henri Bouillard, *Conversion et grâce chez Saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Aubier, Paris, 1944); Gustaf Nygren, *Das Prädestinationsproblem in der Theologie Augustins* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1956), 41–8; McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 24–5, 80–2, 85–6, 104–8.

216 See, e.g., WA 3.169.28–34, 3.535.20–2, 3.549.26–32. See further A. Hamel, *Der junge Luther und Augustin* (2 vols, Gerd Mohn, Gütersloh, 1934–5), vol. I, pp. 157–62.

217 See C. Boyer, "Luther et le 'De spiritu et litera' de Saint Augustin," *Doctor Communis* 21 (1968), 167–87; Leif Grane, *Modus loquendis theologicus: Luthers Kampf um die Erneuerung der Theologie (1515–1518)* (Brill, Leiden, 1975), pp. 65–6.

218 See E. Kähler, *Karlstadt und Augustin: Der Kommentar des Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt zu Augustins Schrift "De spiritu et litera"* (Martin Niemeyer, Halle, 1952); Ronald J. Sider, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt: The Development of His Thought 1517–1525* (Brill, Leiden, 1974), pp. 17–44. Puzzlingly, Sider fails to note the full extent of the continuity between Augustine and Karlstadt on justification: see McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 207–10.

219 See McGrath, *Iustitia* Dei, pp. 190–219.

220 For a study of this complex process, see McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, pp. 95–161.

221 Thus Amsdorf was a Scotist, and Karlstadt initially a neo-Thomist (before becoming a Scotist): see R. Kolb, *Nikolaus von Amsdorf: Popular Polemics in the Preservation of Luther's Legacy* (de Graaf, Nieuwkoop, 1978), p. 28; Kähler, *Karlstadt und Augustin*, 3.19–21 "*quia sectam Capreolinam et Scotisticam manifesta interpretatione successive profitebar.*" On Capreolus and neo-Thomism, to which Karlstadt here refers, see Martin Grabmann, "Johannes Capreolus O. P., der 'Princeps Thomistarum,' und seine Stellung in der Geschichte der Thomistenschule," in L. Ott *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben III* (Hueber, Munich, 1956), pp. 370–410.

222 A. E. McGrath, "Humanist Elements in the Reformed Doctrine of Justification," *ARG* 73 (1982), 5–20.

Chapter 4 Scripture: Translation, Text and Tradition

1 John F. D'Amico, *Theory and Practice in Renaissance Textual Criticism: Beatus Rhenanus Between Conjecture and History* (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, 1988). More generally, see W. Speed Hill (ed.), *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts: Papers of the Renaissance English Text Society* (Renaissance English Text Society, Binghamton, NY, 1993).

2 This had implications for the body of biblical writings collectively held to constitute the Old Testament. The new emphasis upon the importance of studying such documents in their original Hebrew and Aramaic led to a revision of the received canon of Scripture. A philological criterion thus had theological consequences, in the shape of the "Apocrypha" or "Deuterocanonical works" of the

Old Testament. For the issues, see J. Alberto Soggin and R. J. Coggins, *Introduction to the Old Testament from its Origins to the Closing of the Alexandrian Canon* (SCM Press, London, 3rd edn, 1989); Stephen B. Chapman, *The Law and the Prophets: A Study in Old Testament Canon Formation* (Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, 2000).

3 *Summa Theologiae* Ia q. 1 a. 1 "*Necessarium igitur fuit, praeter philosophicas doctrinas, quae per rationem investigantur, sacram doctrinam per revelationem haberi*." Cf. J.-F. Bonnefoy, "La théologie comme science et l'explication de la foi selon saint Thomas d'Aquin," *EThL* 14 (1937), 421–46; 15 (1938), 491–516.

4 *Summa Theologiae* Ia q. 1 a. 8 "*Haec doctrina non argumentatur ad sua principia probanda, quae sunt articuli fidei, sed ex eis procedit ad aliquid aliud ostendendum*." On the developing role of axioms in theological method, see Gillian R. Evans, "Boethian and Euclidian Axiomatic Method in the Theology of the Later Twelfth Century," *Archives internationales d'histoire des sciences* 103 (1980), 13–29.

5 Etienne Gilson, *Le Thomisme: Introduction au système de saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Vrin, Paris, 2nd edn, 1922), pp. 21–2. Cf. *Summa Theologiae* Ia q. 1 a. 2 "*Revelatio divina . . . super quam fundatur sacra scriptura seu doctrina*."

6 *Summa Theologiae* Ia q. 36 a. 2 ad 2um "*De Deo dicere non debemus quod in sacra scriptura non invenitur vel per verba, vel per sensum*."

7 Ibid., Ia q. 1 a. 1. Cf. Per Erik Persson, "Le plan de la Somme théologique et le rapport ratio-revelatio," *Revue philosophique de Louvain* 56 (1958), 545–72.

8 *Summa Theologiae* IIIa q. 55 a. 5 ". . . *per auctoritatem sacrae scripturae, quae est fidei fundamentum*."

9 Ibid., IIa IIae q. 110 a. 3 ad 1um.

10 Ibid., Ia q. 1 a. 10 "*auctor sacrae scripturae est Deus*." Cf. Gillian R. Evans, *The Language and Logic of the Bible: The Road to Reformation* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1985), pp. 7–14.

11 *Quaestiones quodlibetales*, q. 7 a. 14. Cf. *Summa Theologiae* Ia q. 1 a. 8 ad 2um "*Innititur enim fides nostra revelationi Apostolis et Prophetis factae, qui canonicos libros scripserunt*."

12 See, e.g., *Summa Theologiae* Ia q. 9 a. 9 ad 2um; IIaIIae q. 1 a. 9 ad 1um.

13 Occasionally, however, medieval commentators abandoned the Vulgate version of the Psalter in favor of Jerome's later *Psalterium iuxta Hebraicam veritatem*. An example of this is provided by Herbert of Bosham's commentary on the Psalter, discovered by N. R. Ker in the library of St Paul's Cathedral, London: see Beryl Smalley, "A Commentary by Herbert of Bosham on the Hebraica," *RThAM* 18 (1951), 29–65.

14 For the text of the "Clementine Vulgate" see *Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis* (Rome, 1592).

15 Evans, *The Language and Logic of the Bible*, pp. 70–3.

16 See Beryl Smalley, "Andrew of St Victor, Abbot of Wigmore," *RThAM* 10 (1938), 358–73 and "The School of Andrew of St Victor," *RThAM* 11 (1939), 145–671. For the more general attitude of suspicion toward Judaism within western Christianity, see Gilbert Dahan, *La polémique chrétienne contre le judaïsme au Moyen Âge* (Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1991).

17 Peter the Chanter is an important and illuminating exception to this general observation: see Gilbert Dahan, "Les interprétations juives dans les commentaries

du Pentateuch de Pierre le Chantre," in D. Wood and K. Walsh (eds.), *The Bible in the Medieval World* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1985), pp. 131–55.

18 See Leonard E. Boyle, "Innocent III and Vernacular Versions of Scripture," in Walsh and Wood (eds.), *The Bible in the Medieval World*, pp. 97–107, with valuable criticism of the earlier study of Margaret Deanesley, *The Lollard Bible and Other Medieval Biblical Versions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1920). For the correspondence between the Bishop and Innocent III over this matter, see O. Hagenreder et al. (eds.), *Die Register Innocenz III: Pontifikatsjahr 1199/1200* (Verlag der Osterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Rome, 1979), pp. 271–6.

19 The best study of this phenomenon remains Beryl M. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Blackwell, Oxford, 3rd edn, 1983).

20 The virtual absence of any influence of exegetical considerations upon this later period is well illustrated from the role of the lawyers in the Becket dispute: see Beryl M. Smalley, *The Becket Conflict and the Schools: A Study of Intellectuals in Politics in the Twelfth Century* (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1973).

21 On whom see J. Blic, "L'oeuvre exégètique de Walafrid Strabon et la *Glossa Ordinaria*," *RThAM* 16 (1949), 5–28.

22 See Beryl Smalley, "Gilbertus Universalis, Bishop of London (1128–34) and the Problem of the *Glossa Ordinaria*," *RThAM* 7 (1935), 235–62, 8 (1936), 24–46; Smalley, "*La Glossa Ordinaria*, quelques prédécesseurs d'Anselme de Laôn," *RThAM* 9 (1937), 365–400; Smalley, "Les commentaires bibliques de l'époque romane: glose ordinaire et gloses périmées," *Cahiers de civilisation médievale* 4 (1961), 23–46; E. Bertola, "*La Glossa Ordinaria* biblica ed i suoi problemi," *RThAM* 45 (1978), 34–78.

23 See the seminal study of Beryl Smalley and Georges Lacombe, "Studies on the Commentaries of Cardinal Stephen Langton," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 5 (1931), 1–220.

24 See Henry Hargreaves, "The Wycliffite Versions," in *Cambridge History of the Bible* (3 vols, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1963–70), vol. 2, pp. 387–415. The continued use of glosses is significant, in that it points to a reluctance to allow a direct engagement with the text: see Hargreaves, "Popularising Biblical Scholarship: The Role of the Wycliffite Glossed Gospels," in W. Lourdaux and D. Verhelst (eds.), *The Bible and Medieval Culture* (Louvain University Press, Louvain, 1979), pp. 171–89.

25 On the influence of Cicero upon the Latin usage of the early sixteenth century, see Angiola Gambaro, "Il Ciceronianismus di Erasmo da Rotterdam," *Scritti Vari I* (Claudiana, Turin, 1950), pp. 129–84; Giorgio Petrocci, *La dottrina linguistica del Bembo* (Editrice universitaria, Messina, 1959). On Renaissance Ciceronianism in general, see Giuseppe Toffanin, *Storia letteraria d'Italia: Il Cinquecento* (Vallardi, Milan, 6th edn., 1960), pp. 34–81.

26 See, e.g., the extended discussion within Erasmus's *Antibarbari: Opera Omnia*, J. Leclerc (ed.), (Leiden, 1703), vol. 10, pp. 1691–1743.

27 Erasmus, *Opera Omnia*, vol. 6, p. 335C.

28 Melanchthon, *In laudem novae scholae*, in *Werke*, H. Engelland and R. Nürnberger (eds.), (3 vols, Mohr, Tübingen, 1952–61), vol. 3, p. 67. Melanchthon

suggests that a barbaric language inevitably leads to barbaric modes of thought (p. 146).

29 Melanchthon, *Werke*, vol. 3, pp. 135–46. For the relation between scripture and the patristic testimony in Melanchthon's theological method, see Peter Fraenkel, *Testimonia Patrum: The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon* (Droz, Geneva, 1961), pp. 162–252, 338–62.

30 Melanchthon, *Werke*, vol. 3, p. 140.

31 See Deno Geanokoplos, "The Discourse of Demetrius Chalcondyles on the Inauguration of Greek Studies at the University of Padua in 1463," *Studies in the Renaissance* 21 (1974), pp. 119–44.

32 Sarah S. Gravalle, "Lorenzo Valla's Comparison of Latin and Greek and the Humanist Background," *BHR* 44 (1982), 269–89.

33 The most extensive documentation may be found in Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change* (2 vols, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1979). On the role of printing in the propagation of the Reformation, see Mark U. Edwards, *Printing, Propaganda, and Martin Luther* (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, 1994), which makes good use of Koehler's Tübingen Flugschriften project (1500–30). See also the older study of H. J. Louise W. Holborn, "Printing and the Growth of a Protestant Movement in Germany from 1517 to 1524," *Church History* 11 (1942), 123–37.

34 The impact of printing upon New Testament scholarship, of considerable importance in this respect, is discussed by Eisenstein, *The Printing Press*, vol. 1, pp. 329–67.

35 Of those works printed prior to 1501, only one is known to have been printed elsewhere (at Constantinople, in 1493): see A. K. Offenberg, "The First Printed Book Produced at Constantinople," *Studia Rosenthalia: Tijdschrift voor loodse wetenschap et geschiedenis in Nederland 3* (1969), 96–112. A recent estimate places the number of such works at 175: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (16 vols, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, 1971), vol. 8, cols. 1319–44.

36 See Adriaan K. Offenberg, "Untersuchungen zum hebräischen Buchdruck in Neapel um 1490," in Lotte Hellinga and Helmar Härtel (eds.), *Buch und Text im 15. Jahrhundert* (Hauswedell, Hamburg, 1978), pp. 129–41. The situation regarding the printing of Hebrew books rapidly became more complex, as political issues began to overshadow their scholarly counterparts: see, for example, Stephen Burnett, "The Regulation of Hebrew Printing in Germany, 1555–1630: Confessional Politics and the Limits of Jewish Toleration," in Max Reinhart and Thomas Robisheaux (eds.), *Infinite Boundaries: Order, Disorder, and Reorder in Early Modern German Culture* (Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, Kirksville, MO, 1998), pp. 329–48.

37 Offenberg, "Untersuchungen," p. 132.

38 For Pellikan's work on the rabbinical biblical commentaries, see Christoph Zürcher, *Konrad Pellikans Wirken in Zürich 1526–1556* (Theologischer Verlag, Zürich, 1975), pp. 153–236. For the impact of Hebrew on the reformation at Basel, see Thomas Willi, "Der Beitrag des Hebräischen zum Werden der Reformation in Basel," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 35 (1979), 139–54.

39 See, e.g., M. Brod, *Johannes Reuchlin und sein Kampf: Eine historische Monographie* (Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1965), for further details.

40 See the three seminal studies of Siegfried Raeder, *Das Hebräische bei Luther untersucht bis zum Ende der ersten Psalmenvorlesung* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1961), *Die Benutzung des masoretischen Textes bei Luther in der Zeit zwischen der ersten und zweiten Psalmenvorlesung* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1967), *Grammatica Theologica: Studien zu Luthers Operationes in Psalmos* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1977).

41 Hans Peter Rüger, "Karlstadt als Hebraist an der Universität Wittenberg," *ARG* 75 (1984), 297–309, especially pp. 299–302.

42 G. Bauch, "Die Einführung des Hebräischen in Wittenberg mit Berücksichtigung der Vorgeschichte des Studiums der Sprache in Deutschland," *Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 48 (1904), 22–32, 77–86, 145–60, 214–23, 283–99, 328–40, 461–90.

43 For the importance of this document, see D. Maffei, *La Donazione di Constantino nei giuristi medievali* (Giuffre, Milan, 1964).

44 His *Collatio Novi Testamenti* was written about 1444, and has been published in its original form by Alessandro Perosa (Sansoni, Florence, 1970). For a useful analysis, see Christopher S. Celenza, "Renaissance Humanism and the New Testament: Lorenzo Valla's Annotations to the Vulgate," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 24 (1994), 33–52.

45 Salvatore I. Camporeale, *Lorenzo Valla: umanesimo e teologia* (Istituto Palazzo Strozzi, Florence, 1972), pp. 277–403. Note that the variation *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum* is regularly encountered in the literature.

46 For what folIows, see Camporeale, *Lorenzo Valla*, p. 309. The reflections of Guillaume Budé on Valla's philological work are interesting: *Annotationes in Pandectas*, in *Opera Omnia* (4 vols, Basle, 1557), vol. 3, 56C–7A.

47 This date refers to the typesetting of this work, which was not published until March 22, 1520. For details, see Basil Hall, "The Trilingual College of San Ildefonso and the Making of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible," in G. J. Cuming (ed.), *Studies in Church History*, 5 (Brill, Leiden, 1969), pp. 114–46; Jose López Rueda, *Helenistas españoles del siglo XVI* (Facultad de filosofia y letras, Madrid, 1973), pp. 340–8; Jerry H. Bentley, "New Light on the Editing of the Complutensian Polyglot," *BHR* 42 (1980), 145–56.

48 See Roland H. Bainton, *Erasmus of Rotterdam* (Collins, London, 1970), pp. 164–84. For the issues raised, see Jacques Chomorat, "Les *Annotations* de Valla, celles d'Erasme et la grammaire," in Olivier Fatio and Pierre Fraenkel (eds.), *Histoire de l'exégèse au XVIe siècle* (Droz, Geneva, 1978), pp. 202–28. On the importance of the *Annotationes* in relation to the *Novum Instrumentum*, see Jerry H. Bentley, "Erasmus's *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum* and the Textual Criticism of the Gospels," *ARG* 67 (1976), 33–53. The term "Instrumentum" was chosen by Erasmus in preference to "Testamentum" but was abandoned in favor of the original term in later editions.

The first edition of Erasmus's Greek New Testament was seriously inaccurate at points, particularly in relation to printers' errors. There also remain a number of puzzling matters concerning Erasmus's editorial methods. For example, at

several points, Erasmus's textual readings do not correspond to the printed text: see K. W. Clark, "Observations on the Erasmian Notes in Codex 2," *Texte und Untersuchungen* 73 (1959), 755–6.

49 On the historical and theological importance of this theme, see Emil Egli, "Zur Einführung des Schriftprinzips in der Schweiz," *Zwingliana* 1 (1903), 332–9.

50 *CR* (Zwingli) 3.445.6.

51 Ibid., 4.417.23–419.6.

52 *WA* 15.37.4–16; 38.8–12.

53 Ibid., 15.28.30–1; 42.23–43.1.

54 *Die evangelischen Schulordnungen des 16. Jahrhunderts*, R. Vormbaum (ed.), (Mohn, Gütersloh, 1860), vol. 1, pp. 68–73. A similar pattern is evident throughout Lutheran Germany: see Gerald Strauss, "Lutheranism and Literacy: A Reassessment," in Kasper von Greyerz (ed.), *Religion and Society in Early Modern Europe 1500–1800* (Allen & Unwin, London, 1984), pp. 109–23, especially pp. 114–15.

55 C. Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1927); G. Pare, A. Brunet, and P. Tremblay, *La renaissance du XIIe siècle* (Vrin, Paris, 1933); W. A. Nitze, "The So-called Twelfth Century Renaissance," *Speculum* 23 (1948), 464–71; E. M. Sandford, "The Twelfth-Century: Renaissance or Proto-Renaissance?" *Speculum* 26 (1951), 635–42.

56 Valla, *Collatio*, Perosa (ed.), 95.2–28, especially 13–20: "*sciant ergo apud Grecos non dici 'gratia piena' sed, ut sic dicarn, 'gratiata' vel 'gratificata,' hoc est 'que donata est gratia'. . . Maria in gratia Dei esse dicitur*"; Erasmus, *Opera Omnia*, vol. 6, 223D-F.

57 Erasmus, *Opera Omnia*, vol. 6, 223D-F. It should be noted that Erasmus's translation of certain Vulgate passages caused considerable misgivings, particularly his translation of John 1.1 as "*In principium erat sermo*" rather than the traditional "*In principium erat verbum*." See C. A. L. Jarrott, "Erasmus' *In principio erat sermo*: A Controversial Translation," *Studies in Philology* 61 (1964), 35–40.

58 See Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1998), pp. 91–100, for further discussion.

59 See Helmut Feld, *Martin Luthers und Wendelin Steinbachs Vorlesungen über den Hebräerbrief* (Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1971), pp. 43–52.

60 Erasmus, *Opera Omnia*, vol. 6, 985–6.

61 Feld, *Vorlesungen über den Hebräerbrief*, pp. 47–51.

62 Ibid., p. 56 n. 165.

63 *WA* 57 III.116–20.

64 Feld, *Vorlesungen über den Hebräerbrief*, pp. 58–65.

65 See the classic studies of Guido Astuti, *Mos italicus e mos gallicus nei dialoghi "De iuris interpretibus" di Alberico Gentili* (Zanichelli, Bologna, 1937); Guido Kisch, *Humanismus und Jurisprudenz: Der Kampf zwischen mos italicus und mos gailicus an der Universität Basel* (Helbing & Lichtenhahn, Basle, 1955), pp. 9–76. The older study of Roderich Stinzing, *Geschichte der deutschen Rechtswissenschaft I* (Oldenbourg, Munich, 1880), pp. 106–45, is still useful. For a detailed study of one leading exponent of the *mos italicus*, see Mario Ascheri, *Un maestro del "mos italicus": Gianfrancesco Sannazari della Ripa, 1480c.–1535* (Giuffre, Milan, 1970).

66 Kisch, *Humanismus und Jurisprudenz*, p. 20 "*An die Stelle der glossierenden oder kommentierenden Methode sollte die kritische Quellenforschung treten, und aus ihrer Ergebnissen sich das Streben nach umfassender und dauerend gültiger Rechtserkenntnis entwickeln.*" Cf. p. 18 "*Rückkehr zur reinen Rechtsquelle statt bloßer Anerkennung der Tradition, Erkenntnis der Rechtsidee statt des Autoritätenkults, System statt Exegese nach der 'Legalordnung.'*"

67 Bainton, *Erasmus of Rotterdam*, p. 85.

68 P. O. Kristeller, "The European Diffusion of Italian Humanism," in *Renaissance Thought II: Papers on Humanism and the Arts* (Harper, New York, 1965), pp. 69–88.

69 S. Jayne, *John Colet and Marsilio Ficino* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1963); J. K. McConica, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1965).

70 A. Renaudet, "Un problème historique: La pensée religieuse de J. Lefèvre d'Etaples," in *Medioevo e Rinascimento: studi in onore di Bruno Nardi II* (Sansoni, Florence, 1955), pp. 621–50; E. F. Rice, "The Humanist Idea of Christian Antiquity: Lefèvre d'Etaples and his Circle," *Studies in the Renaissance* 9 (1962), 126–60; R. M. Cameron, "The Charges of Lutheranism Brought Against Jacques Lefèvre d'Etaples," *HThR* 63 (1970), 119–49.

71 Brod, *Johannes Reuchlin und sein Kampf*; L. W. Spitz, *The Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1963), pp. 61–80.

72 McConica, *English Humanists*, pp. 13–43; Robert Stupperich, "Das Enchiridion Militis Christiani des Erasmus von Rotterdam nach seiner Entstehung, seinem Sinn und Charakter," *ARG* 69 (1978), 5–23.

73 Luther's views on the role of language serve to emphasize the importance of this point: see Bengt Hägglund, "Martin Luther über die Sprache," *Neue Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie* 26 (1984), 1–12.

74 It is important to appreciate a tension that existed between humanist and Reformer at this point: the humanist regarded the authority of Scripture to lie in its antiquity or eloquence, whereas the Reformers (especially Luther) regarded it as grounded in its unique nature as the "Word of God": see Alister E. McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross: Martin Luther's Theological Breakthrough* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1985), p. 51.

75 H. J. de Jonge, "Novum Testamentum a nobis versum: The Essence of Erasmus' Edition of the New Testament," *Journal of Theological Studies* 35 (1984), 394–400. For Renaissance attitudes to the New Testament apocrypha, see Irena Backus, "Renaissance Attitudes to New Testament Apocryphal Writings: Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and his Epigones," *Renaissance Quarterly* 51 (1998), 1169–98.

76 For discussion, see Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1992).

77 Bart D. Ehrman, Michael W. Holmes, and Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, 1995), p. 302 n. 28. For the best attempt to reconstruct this text, see Zane Clark Hodges and Arthur L. Farstad, *The Greek New Testament according to the Majority Text* (Abingdon, Nashville, TN, 1985).

78 John F. D'Amico, *Theory and Practice in Renaissance Textual Criticism: Beatus Rhenanus Between Conjecture and History* (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, 1988).

79 Ibid., pp. 34–5.

80 Augsburg, University Library Codex I. 1.4.1 (containing only the book of Revelation, missing its final leaf). This manuscript does not, it should be noted, belong to the Byzantine family of texts. The attitude of Reformers to this last book of the Bible is of considerable interest in its own right: see Irena Backus, *Les sept visions et la fin des temps: les commentaires genevois de l'Apocalypse entre 1539 et 1584* (Droz, Geneva, 1997); *Reformation Readings of the Apocalypse: Geneva, Zurich, and Wittenberg* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000).

81 Charles Augrain, "À propos du Comma Johanneum," *Moreana* 35 (1998), 87–94. The "Comma" was included in the 1522 edition.

82 Erika Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics* (De Graaf, Nieuwkoop, 1989), pp. 1–13.

83 Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics*, pp. 145–77; Richard H. Graham, "Erasmus and Stunica: A Chapter in the History of New Testament Scholarship," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 10 (1990), 9–60.

84 Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics*, pp. 95–120; Robert Coogan, *Erasmus, Lee and the Correction of the Vulgate: The Shaking of the Foundations* (Droz, Geneva, 1992).

85 For example, see the classic nineteenth-century study of Gotthard V. Lechler, *Johann von Wiclif und die Vorgeschichte der Reformation* (2 vols, Friedrich Fleischer, Leipzig, 1873).

86 This recognition dates from earlier in the present century: see Friedrich Kropatschek, *Das Schriftprinzip der lutherischen Kirche I: Die Vorgeschichte: Das Erbe des Mittelalters* (Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig, 1904), pp. 438–41.

87 See the seminal study of Paul de Vooght, *Les sources de la doctrine chrétienne d'après les théologiens du XIVe siècle et du début du XVe* (Desclée de Brouwer, Bruges, 1954), which may be compared with the older study of Johannes Beumer, "Das katholische Schriftprinzip in der theologischen Literatur der Scholastik bis zur Reformation," *Scholastik* 16 (1941), 24–52.

88 Scotus, *Ordinatio*, praefatio, 123; 204. Cf. Eligius Buytaert, "Circa doctrinam Duns Scoti de traditione et de scriptura adnotationes," *Antonianum* 40 (1965), 346–62.

89 See the important study of Hermann Schüssler, *Der Primät der Heiligen Schrift als theologisches und kanonistisches Problem im Spätmittelalter* (Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1977), p. 73: "*Daß die Hl. Schrift die maßgebende Quelle und Norm der Theologie wie der Kirchenlehre sei, ist der gesamten Spätscholastik selbstverständliche Voraussetzung gewesen.*" Cf. de Vooght, *Les sources de la doctrine chrétienne*, p. 255 "*Lorsque les théologiens du XIVe siècle affirmaient ainsi que l'Écriture seule est la source de la doctrine chrétienne, ils entendaient par là qu'elle était, seule, purement et simplement la parole de Dieu, infaillable et immuable, dictée par le Saint-Esprit, complète et sans rivale.*"

90 Heiko A. Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1963), pp. 361–412; *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought* (Holt Rinehart and Winston, Philadelphia, 1981), pp. 53–66.

91 For example, George H. Tavard, *Holy Writ or Holy Church: The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation* (Burns & Oates, London, 1959).

92 J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink, "Tradition und Heilige Schrift am Anfang des dritten Jahrhunderts," *Catholica* 9 (1953), 105–14; Bengt Hägglund, "Die Bedeutung der 'regula fidei' als Grundlage theologischer Aussagen," *Studia Theologica* 12 (1958), 1–44.

93 G. G. Blum, *Tradition und Sukzession: Studien zum Normbegriff des Apostolischen von Paulus bis Irenaeus* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1963).

94 See the important early study of Gerhard Ebeling, *Kirchengeschichte als Geschichte der Auslegung der Helligen Schrift* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1947), where this theme is fruitfully developed.

95 *Summa* q. 5 a. 1; edn in de Vooght, *Sources de la doctrine chrétienne*, 356.32–4: "*si congregacio alica uellet scripturam istam mutare et oppositum tenere, iam non esset congregacio et ecclesia Dei. Et sic isti scripture esset credendum, et non tam tali ecclesiae.*" See further de Vooght, pp. 33–59. Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* Ia q. 1 a. 8 ad 2um.

96 On Gratian, see Stephan Kuttner, *Gratian and the Schools of Law 1140–1234* (Variorum Reprints, London, 1983).

97 Oberman, *Harvest of Medieval Theology*, pp. 369–75, citation p. 372. Cf. Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation*, p. 58.

98 Basil, *De spiritu sancto*, 66. This passage is incorporated into Gratian's *Decretum* at dist. xi cap. 5.

99 Gratian, *Decretum*, dist. i, cap. 1.

100 Brian Tierney, "Pope and Council: Some New Decretist Texts," *Medieval Studies* 19 (1957), 197–218; citation at p. 201 n. 20. For Tierney's later work on such themes, see *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory: The Contribution of the Medieval Canonists from Gratian to the Great Schism* (Brill, Leiden, 1998).

101 Oberman, *Harvest of Medieval Theology*, p. 373.

102 See, e.g., Charles Munier, *Les sources patristiques du droit de l'église* (Salvator, Mulhouse, 1957), p. 200.

103 The following list, taken from Guido de Baysio, *Rosarium,* dist. xx cap. 3, is instructive: "*Prima recurrendum est ad rescripti novi et veteris testamenti. Secundo ad canones apostolorum et conciliorum. Tertio ad decreta vel decretalia romanorum pontificum. Quarto ad scripta graeca. Postea ad scripta sanctorum patrum latinorum.*" Cf. Schüssler, *Der Primät der Heiligen Schrift*, pp. 78–80. It is important not to make the mistake of assuming that the "*scripta graeca*" refer to the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament; a reference to the theological and other writings of the eastern church is to be understood here.

104 As pointed out, with documentation, by Tavard, *Holy Writ or Holy Church*, pp. 38–9.

105 See the careful and well-documented study of Stephan Kuttner, "Pope Lucius III and the Bigamous Archbishop of Palermo," in J. Watt et al. (eds.), *Medieval Studies Presented to Aubrey Gwynn* (Lochlainn, Dublin, 1961), pp. 409–53.

106 *Extravagantes Johannis XXII* (Antwerp, 1572), tit. xiv, cap. 5 "*Profecto hoc ad fidem non pertinet, cum de hoc articulus non sit aliquis, nec sub qua valeat comprehendi, ut patet in symbolis in quibis articuli fidei continentur, nec etiam reducte, ne quasi hoc sacra*

scriptura contineat, qua negato tota scriptura sacra redditur dubia, et per consequens articuli fidei, qui habent per scripturam sacram probari, redduntur dubii et incerti." See further M. D. Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty: The Doctrine of the Absolute Poverty of Christ and the Apostles in the Franciscan Order 1210–1323* (SPCK, London, 1961).

107 Guido de Baysio, *Rosarium*, dist. xv, cap. 1.

108 *Extravagantes Johannis XXII*, tit. xiv, cap. 4.

109 Johannes Breviscoxa, *de fide et ecclesia*, iii. For the full text, see *Ioannis Gersonii Opera Omnia* (Sumptibus Societatis, Antwerp, 1706), vol. 1, pp. 805–903.

110 See Oberman, *Harvest of Medieval Theology*, pp. 398–401.

111 See de Vooght, *Sources de la doctrine chrétienne*, p. 186 n. 4.

112 For example, Johannes Breviscoxa (Courtcuisse), *De fide et ecclesia*, in Jean Gerson, *Opera*, L. E. duPin (ed.), (5 vols, Sumptibus Societatis, Antwerp, 1706), vol. I, 805–903, citation 830A. See Oberman, *Harvest of Medieval Theology*, pp. 387–8; *Forerunners of the Reformation*, pp. 60–2. A partial English translation of this work may be found in this latter work, at pp. 67–92.

113 Breviscoxa here draws his examples from Ockham's *Dialogus*, Melchior Goldast (ed.), (Graz, 1960), p. 413.

114 de Vooght, *Sources de la doctrine chrétienne*, pp. 159–60.

115 Schüssler, *Primät der Heiligen Schrift*, p. 91:

> *Der Befund bei den wichtigsten spätmittelalterlichen Zeugen für die "mündliche Tradition" zeigt also, daß diese für die Diskussion um die Schrift-authorität eine geringere Bedeutung besessen hat als heute gelegentlich angenommen wird. Wir haben schon oben darauf hingewiesen, daß die Theologie des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts sich auch weiterhin grundsätzlich als Schrifttheologie verstanden und die Hl. Schrift als die Grundlage der theologischen Arbeit wie des Glaubens überhaupt betrachtet wird.*

116 Johannes Hiltalingen of Basle, *In IV Sent*. prol. q. 4 a. 3; cited de Vooght, *Sources de la doctrine chrétienne*, p. 121.

117 de Vooght, *Sources de la doctrine chrétienne*, p. 149: "*Les textes ne manquent pas – ils sont au contraire fréquents – ou la designation de l'Ecriture comme la source de la doctrine chrétienne est accompagnée du mot sola.*"

118 Schüssler, *Primät der Heiligen Schrift*, p. 72 and references therein.

119 Bonaventure, *In IV Sent*. dist. iii pars 1 a. 2 q. 2: "*si Christus non instituit, instituit Ecclesia instinctu Spiritus sancti, et hoc tantum est ac si proprio ore dixisset.*"

120 For the views of Bradwardine (usually regarded either as a precursor or early representative of the *schola Augustiniana moderna*) on the sufficiency of scripture, see Heiko A. Oberman, *Archbishop Thomas Bradwardine: A Fourteenth Century Augustinian* (Kemink & Zoon, Utrecht, 1957), pp. 22–7.

121 See Adolar Zumkeller, "Die Augustinertheologen Simon Fidati von Cascia und Hugolin von Orvieto und Martin Luthers Kritik an Aristoteles," *ARG* 54 (1963), 13–37.

122 *WA* 9.23.7; 43.5.

123 As I demonstrated elsewhere: McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross: Martin Luther's Theological Breakthrough*, pp. 136–41.

124 For example, *WA* 3.318.3–6; 516.40–517.4.
125 For example, *WA* 3.517.33–40; 4.25.12–17.
126 *WA* 3.268.37–8.
127 The suggestion that Wycliffe denies any theological role to tradition (e.g., Michael Hurley, "*Scriptura sola*: Wyclif and his Critics," *Traditio* 16 (1960), 275–352, following Thomas Netter Waldensis, *Doctrinale antiquitatum fidei catholicae ecclesiae*) is misleading, apparently arising from a failure to distinguish "Tradition I" and "Tradition II," and restricting the sense of "tradition" to the latter. As de Vooght so perceptively points out (*Sources de la doctrine chrétienne*, p. 197 n. 1): "*Prétendre que Wiclif n'admettait pas la tradition . . . c'est lui attribuer gratuitment une opinion dont il n'avait pas l'idée*."
128 Emil Egli, "Zur Einführung des Schriftprinzips in der Schweiz," *Zwingliana* 1 (1903), 332–9.
129 Oberman, *Harvest of Medieval Theology*, pp. 406–12.
130 Kropatschek, *Schriftprinzip der lutherischen Kirche*, pp. 438–41.
131 Ibid., pp. 348–59.
132 Ibid., pp. 357–9.
133 Huss, *Tractatus de ecclesia*, cap. 18 N; S. Harrison Thomson (ed.), (Heffer, Cambridge, 1956), p. 167: "*signum autem defectus pape est si postposita lege dei et devotis evangelii professoribus tradicionibus attendit humanis . . . permitteret garrire leges humanas in palacio et silere legem Christi, que est lex immaculata convertens animas*."

Chapter 5 The Interpretation of Scripture

1 Henri de Lubac, *Histoire et ésprit: l'intelligence de l'écriture d'après Origene* (Aubier, Paris, 1950); Michael Fiedrowicz, *Prinzipien der Schriftauslegung in der Alten Kirche* (Peter Lang, Bern, 1998). For a series of excellent studies of patristic exegesis, see Thomas F. Torrance, *Divine Meaning: Studies in Patristic Hermeneutics* (T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1995). For a useful general guide to recent literature on the exposition of scripture in the Reformation period, see Beate Stierle, "Schriftauslegung der Reformationszeit," *Verkündigung und Forschung* 16 (1971), 55–88.
2 See the debate over the putative influence of Lucian of Antioch and Peter of Alexandria upon Origen: T. E. Pollard, "The Origins of Arianism," *Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1958), 103–11; "The Exegesis of Scripture and the Arian Controversy," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 42 (1958–9), 414–29.
3 Gillian R. Evans, *The Language and Logic of the Bible: The Earlier Middle Ages* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1984), pp. 114–22. See further Glenn S. Holland, "Augustine's Hermeneutics in Polemic and Apologetic: The Case of *De Sermon Domini in Monte*," *Proceedings: Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies* 7 (1987), 117–29.
4 See, e.g., Bonaventure, *Breviloquium*, prol. 4, 1; *Collationes in Hexameron* xiii, 11. See further George H. Tavard, *Transiency and Permanence: The Nature of Theology according to St Bonaventure* (Franciscan Institute, New York/Louvain, 1954), pp. 31–55. On Bernard of Clairvaux's development of such hermeutical tools, see Dagmar Heller, *Schriftauslegung und geistliche Erfahrung bei Bernhard von Clairvaux* (Echter, Würzburg, 1990).

5 S. A. Walz, "Des Aage von Dänemark 'Rotulus Pugillaris' im Lichte der dominikanischen Kontroverstheologie," *Classica et Medievalia* (Copenhagen) 15 (1954), 198–252, 16 (1955), 136–94.

6 See, e.g., Thomas Aquinas, *In I Sent.* prol. q. 1 aa. 5, 7; A. Haufnagel, "Wort Gottes: Sinn und Bedeutung nach Thomas von Aquin," in Helmut Feld and J. Nolte (eds.), *Wort Gottes in der Zeit* (Patmos-Verlag, Düsseldorf, 1973), pp. 236–56; Fritz Hahn, "Zur Hermeneutik Gersons," *ZThK* 51 (1954), 34–50; Helmut Feld, *Die Anfänge der modernen biblischen Hermeneutik in der spätmittelalterlichen Theologie* (Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1977), pp. 70–83.

7 Karl Holl, "Luthers Bedeutung für den Fortschritt der Auslegungskunst," in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* (3 vols, Mohr, Tübingen, 7th edn, 1948), vol. I, pp. 544–82, especially pp. 545–50.

8 *WA* 3.11.33–5: "*In Scripturis . . . nulla valet allegoria, tropologia, anagoge, nisi alibi hystorice idem expresse dicatur. Alioquin ludibrium fieret Scriptura.*" Cf. *WA* 4.305.6–8.

9 *WA* 2.550.34–552.19.

10 For example, E. Vogelsang, *Die Anfänge von Luthers Christologie* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin/Leipzig, 1929), based particularly upon WA 3.466.26–8. For a criticism of this view, and the suggestion that Luther merely clarifies (rather than alters) his existing views at this point, see Alister E. McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross: Martin Luther's Theological Breakthrough* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1985), pp. 119–28.

11 Erasmus, *Opera Omnia*, vol. 5, 9A-B. Note also the tendency to treat the allegorizing Origen as equal to Paul: 29 F. Critics have noted Erasmus's occasional tendency to revert to Origenistic spiritualism (e.g., Gerhard Ebeling, *Evangelische Evangelienauslegung: Eine Untersuchung zu Luthers Hermeneutik* (Albert Lempp, Munich, 1942), p. 139). For an excellent study of Erasmus's later (1516) use of Origen, see André Godin, "Fonction d'Origène dans la pratique exégétique d'Erasme: Les annotations sur l'épître aux Romains," in Olivier Fatio and Pierre Fraenkel (eds.), *Histoire de l'exégèse au XVIe siècle* (Droz, Geneva, 1978), pp. 17–44. More generally, see Peter Walter, *Theologie aus dem Geist der Rhetorik: Sur Schriftauslegung des Erasmus von Rotterdam* (Matthias Grünewald Verlag, Mainz, 1991).

12 See *Ratio verae theologiae* (1518), Hajo and Annemarie Holborn (eds.), (Walter de Gruyter, Munich, 1933), pp. 284–92. Note the critical reference to Origen at 284.26–7: "*Immodicus est ac plerumque iniquior historico sensui quam par est.*" With his predilection for Jerome's philological achievements, Erasmus could hardly overlook the latter's criticism of Origen (287.27–9), "*quod aliquoties vim faciat Scripturae, opinor, ut nos prorsus abducat a littera, plerumque sterili.*"

13 See, for example, *Opera Omnia* vol. 5,1034C–1035A.

14 Manfred Hoffmann, *Rhetoric and Theology: The Hermeneutic of Erasmus* (University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1994), pp. 101–6.

15 John B. Payne, "Towards the Hermeneutics of Erasmus," in J. Coppens (ed.), *Scrinium Erasmianum II* (Brill, Leiden, 1970), pp. 13–49, especially pp. 45–8.

16 See the important study of Mary Jane Bennett, "Erasmus and the Hermeneutics of Biblical Practice," *Renaissance Quarterly* 49 (1996), 542–72.

17 *Opera Omnia*, vol. 5, 1050A-B. Tropological exegesis also possesses the virtue of simplicity; Erasmus frequently criticizes Origen for his elaborate allegorical exegesis: *Opera Omnia*, vol. 6, 554A; 560B; 564C.

18 *Opera Omnia*, vol. 7, 787–9.

19 *Opus epistolarum Erasmi*, P. S. Allen (ed.), (12 vols, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1906–58), vol. 2, no. 541, 487–92, 491.133–9: "*Unus adhuc scrupulus habet animum meum, ne sub obtextu priscae litteraturae renascentis caput erigere conetur paganismus . . . aut ne renascentibus Hebraeorum literis, Judaismus meditetur per occasionem reviviscere: qua peste nihil adversius nihilque infensius inveniri potest doctrinae Christi*." For the earlier letter of Capito, dated September 2, 1516, see no. 459, 333–8. See further Gerald Hobbs, "Monitio amica: Pellican à Capito sur le danger des lectures rabbiniques," in Marijn de Kroon and Marc Lienhard (eds.), *Horizons européens de la Réforme In Alsace* (Librairie Istra, Strasbourg, 1980), pp. 81–93. On Capito, see James M. Kittelson, *Wolfgang Capito: From Humanist to Reformer* (Brill, Leiden, 1975).

20 See the discussion in Gilbert Dahan, *Les intellectuels chrétiens et les juifs au moyen âge* (Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1990), pp. 475–80. On Rashi in this respect, see Benjamin Gelles, *Peshat and Daresh in the Exegesis of Rashi* (Brill, Leiden, 1981).

21 Gerald Hobbs, "Martin Bucer on Psalm 22: A Study in the Application of Rabbinical Exegesis by a Christian Hebraist," in Olivier Fatio and Pierre Fraenkel (eds.), *Histoire de l'exégèse au XVIe siècle* (Droz, Geneva, 1978), pp. 144–63. On Rashi, see Gérard Nahon, Gilbert Dahan, and Elie Nicolas, *Rashi et la culture juive en France du Nord au moyen âge* (Peeters, Paris, 1997).

22 For the apologetic importance of this consideration, see Erwin Rosenthal, "Anti-Christian Polemic in Medieval Biblical Commentaries," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 11 (1960), 115–35.

23 Hobbs, "Bucer on Psalm 22," p. 151.

24 For details and comment, see David L. Puckett, *John Calvin's Exegesis of the Old Testament* (Westminster-John Knox Press, Louisville, KY, 1995), pp. 1–24.

25 *Quincuplex Psalterium* (Paris, 1509), *praefatio*. For comment, see Guy Bedouelle, *Lefèvre d'Etaples et l'intelligence des écritures* (Droz, Geneva, 1976), and more generally, *Le Quincuplex Psalterium de Lefèvre d'Etaples: un guide de lecture* (Droz, Geneva, 1979). There are some useful points still to be found in the rather dated study of Fritz Hahn, "Faber Stapulensis und Luther," *ZKG* 57 (1938), 356–432.

26 Lefèvre elsewhere makes it clear that he is prepared to recognize subsidiary senses of Scripture, such as the tropological or allegorical: *Quincuplex Psalterium*, fol. 159 A. However, the *primary* sense of scripture is the "literal-spiritual" sense noted above, and contrasted with the "literal-carnal" sense of rabbinical exegesis.

27 Wilfrid Werbeck, *Jacobus Pérez von Valencia: Untersuchungen zu seinem Psalmenkommentar* (Mohr, Tübingen 1959), pp. 112–23; Wolfgang Bunte, *Rabbinische Traditionen bei Nikolaus von Lyra: Ein Beitrag zur Schriftauslegung des Spätmittelalters* (Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, 1994). There are some useful assessments of Lyra's importance in Jeremy Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism* (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY, 1982), pp. 174–95.

28 Hans Peterse, *Jacobus Hoogstraeten gegen Johannes Reuchlin: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Antijudaismus im 16. Jahrhundert* (Zabern, Mainz, 1995), pp. 104–14.

29 The former is also occasionally designated the *sensus literalis improprius* or *sensus literalis humano sensu fictus*; the latter the *sensus literalis proprius* or *sensus literalis divino spiritu infusus*.

30 Augustine, *De spiritu et litera* iv, 6 – v, 8. For a detailed analysis of Lefèvre's methods, see Guy Bedouelle, "La lecture christologique du Psautier dans le *Quincuplex Psalterium* de Lefèvre d'Etaples," in Olivier Fatio and Pierre Fraenkel (eds.), *Histoire de l'exégèse au XVIe siècle* (Droz, Geneva, 1978), pp. 133–43.

31 Helmut Feld, *Martin Luthers und Wendelin Steinbachs Vorlesungen über den Hebräerbrief* (Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1971), pp. 145–52, especially pp. 146–7.

32 See, e.g., Christine Christ, "Das Schriftverständnis von Zwingli und Erasmus im Jahre 1522," *Zwingliana* 16 (1983), 111–25, see pp. 122–3:

> *In der Zwingliforschung wurde bis anhin ein Zwingli, den man vielfach von seinen Spätschriften her interpretierte, dem Verfasser des "Enchiridions" (1503) gegenüberstellt, wurden spätere Erasmusschriften herangezogen, so wurden ihre "reformatorisch" klingenden Abschnitte mit Zitaten aus dem "Enchiridion" sofort abgeschwächt. Wohl ist es richtig, daß etwa Bibelzitate aus dem "Enchiridion" vorn Programm der "humanistischen Bildungsform" (Schottenloher) her verstanden werden müssen, und wo das in der Erasmusforschung unterlassen wurde, ist das "Enchiridion" auch mißverstanden worden. Aber der Herausgeber der Neuen Testaments nach 1516 ist nicht mehr der junge Humanist von 1503, Erasmus hatte inzwischen die Bibel lang genug studiert, um etwa den Unterschied zwischen einem platonisierenden Bildungsaufsteig und der christlichen Erlösung durch Gottes Gnade zu kennen.*

33 Ibid., pp. 121–5.

34 *CR* (Zwingli) 2.398.17–400.6; 6 I.404.2–9.

35 See here the excellent study of Ralf Hoburg, *Seligkeit und Heilsgewissheit: Hermeneutik und Schriftauslegung bei Huldrych Zwingli bis 1522* (Calwer Verlag, Stuttgart, 1994).

36 Walther Köhler, "Die Randglossen Zwinglis zum Römerbrief in seiner Abschrift der paulinischen Briefe 1516/17," in *Forschungen zur Kirchengeschichte und zur christlichen Kunst: Johannes Ficker als Festgahe zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht* (Dieterich, Leipzig, 1931), pp. 86–106. The dependence of Zwingli upon humanist philology in his translation of this letter has also been carefully documented: Adolf Meier, "Zwinglis Übersetzung des Römerbriefs," *Evangelische Theologie* 19 (1959), 40–52.

37 Gerhard Krause, "Zwinglis Auslegung der Propheten," *Zwingliana* 11 (1960), 257–65.

38 *CR* (Zwingli) 6 II.305.28–308.14; 13.213.8–12; 299.31–2; 374.24–7.

39 Ibid., 6 II.305.28–308.14.

40 Edwin Künzli, "Quellenproblem und mystischer Schriftsinn in Zwinglis Genesis und Exoduskommentar," *Zwingliana* 9 (1949–54), 185–207, 253–307, especially pp. 257–80. This analysis illustrates with some brilliance both the wide range of, and the inherent contradiction within, Zwingli's use of allegory.

41 See W. P. Stephens, *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1986), pp. 78–9.

42 For example, *CR* (Zwingli) 6 II.305.6–27; 14.23–15.8; 361.27–35; 373.2–4.
43 Two particularly suspicious cases may be noted: *CR* (Zwingli) 13.66.1–8; 347.7–10. There is also a certain fluidity in Zwingli's typology: Abraham is treated as a type of God at one point, and of the faithful people of God at another; Isaac represents Christ at one point, the faithful people of God at another, and God at a third.
44 The best study remains Johannes Müller, *Martin Bucers Hermeneutik* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Gütersloh, 1965).
45 Ibid., pp. 142–50, with important documentation.
46 Ibid., pp. 142–4; cf. *CR* (Zwingli) 1.421.12–423.9.
47 Müller, *Martin Bucers Hermeneutik*, pp. 145–7.
48 Ibid., pp. 100–14.
49 Ibid., pp. 106–11.
50 See Heiko A. Oberman, *Werden und Wertung der Reformation* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1977), pp. 248–66. On the city council, see Norman Birnbaum, "The Zwinglian Reformation in Zurich," *Past and Present* 15 (1959), 27–47.
51 Oberman, *Werden und Wertung der Reformation*, pp. 250–1.
52 *CR* (Zwingli) 1.471.2 "*. . . so lang und vil, biß er eins besseren bericht werde.*" As Oberman points out (p. 249), "*er*" must be understood to refer to "Zwingli" and not "the Council" (*der Rat*, which takes the masculine pronoun in German).
53 According to Adam Sprungli, only 14 out of the 48 members of the council favored evangelicalism: see Oberman, *Werden und Wertung der Reformation*, pp. 258–9. Although Sprungli's criteria for "evangelicalism" were perhaps a little severe, his analysis appears to have been along the right lines.
54 The parallels with Geneva and Erfurt are instructive here: see Robert M. Kingdom, "Was the Protestant Reformation a Revolution? The Case of Geneva," in R. M. Kingdom (ed.), *Transition and Revolution: Problems and Issues of European Renaissance and Reformation History* (Burgess, Minneapolis, 1974), pp. 53–107; Robert W. Scribner, "Civic Unity and the Reformation in Erfurt," *Past and Present* 66 (1975), 29–60.
55 For example, *WA* 3.11.33–5.
56 See the masterly essay of Gerhard Ebeling, "Die Anfänge von Luthers Hermeneutik," in *Lutherstudien I* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1971), pp. 1–68, especially pp. 51–61.
57 *WA* 3.11.17–31.
58 Ibid., 3.46.28–9; 369.6 "*Hec omnia Christus simul.*"
59 Ibid., 3.12.14–19. For what follows, see Ebeling, "Anfänge von Luthers Hermeneutik," pp. 54–61.
60 *WA* 3.12.11–13.
61 Ibid., 3.13.6–13.
62 Ibid., 3.318.24–8.
63 Ibid., 55 II.67.16–19.
64 Ibid., 3.318.18–24.
65 Ibid., 4.134.20 "*lex spiritualis et evangelium idem sunt*"; 55 1.92.16–20 "*lex spiritualiter intellecta est idem cum evangelio.*"

66 Ibid., 4.475.1–4; 11–13. For the distinction between the "back" and the "face" of God, as developed in the *theologia crucis*, see McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, pp. 147–50.
67 *WA* 3.116.5–8.
68 For example, *WA* 4.134.20.
69 Ibid., 55 I.4.25–7.
70 Ibid., 3.46.28–9. Cf. Ebeling, "Anfänge von Luthers Hermeneutik," pp. 60–1.
71 Ebeling, "Anfänge von Luthers Hermeneutik," pp. 61–8. Ebeling suggests (p. 62) that Luther's concept of faith is already sufficiently future-orientated to permit him to treat it merely as one aspect of the *sensus propheticus*.
72 Erasmus, *Opera Omnia*, vol. 7, 789F.
73 *WA* 3.532.23–6.
74 Ebeling, "Anfänge von Luthers Hermeneutik," pp. 64–6.
75 *WA* 3.529.33. Cf. *WA* 3.156.2–3; 195.2–3; 530.21–2.
76 Ibid., 3.465.33–5; 4.22.36 "*id est qua nos sapientes, fortes, iusti et humiles vel iudicati sumus*."
77 J. S. Preus, *From Shadow to Promise: Old Testament Interpretation from Augustine to the Young Luther* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1969), argued that the tropological sense hindered rather than assisted Luther's theological reflections. This improbable suggestion clearly rests upon a confusion of what Luther understands by *sensus propheticus*, among other points. See the convincing rebuttals by Gordon Rupp, *Journal of Theological Studies* 23 (1972), 276–8; Scott Hendrix, *Ecclesia in Via: Ecclesiological Developments in the Medieval Psalms Exegesis and the Dictata super Psalterium of Martin Luther* (Brill, Leiden, 1974). A more important criticism of the theory that Luther's breakthrough rests upon the *sensus tropologicus* concerns the apparent absence of any genuine breakthrough at this point – what is encountered is a terminological clarification within the framework of his *existing* thought: see McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, pp. 113–28, 146. Helmar Junghans has suggested that Luther's theological breakthrough, including his discovery of the "new" meaning of *iustitia Dei*, resulted from a new attitude to the Word of God, particularly a new manner of attending to the text of scripture: Junghans, *Der junge Luther und die Humanisten* (Mohr, Göttingen, 1985), p. 287. While we remain unconvinced by Junghans's arguments on this specific point, it is clear that Luther's scholastic approach to the *interpretation* of scripture at this stage has indeed been supplemented by a new concern to *revere* scripture, perhaps deriving from Erfurt humanism in the manner Junghans suggests.
78 *WA* 3.369.2–10; 541.38–542.2; 4.189.1–4.
79 For example, *WA* 4.216.40–1.
80 Karl Bauer, *Die Wittenberger Universitätstheologie und die Anfänge der Deutschen Reformation* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1928), especially pp. 145–7.
81 Ibid., pp. 21–2, 147. See further Ebeling, "Anfänge von Luthers Hermeneutik," pp. 4–6.
82 See, e.g., David C. Steinmetz, *Luther and Staupitz: An Essay in the Intellectual Origins of the Protestant Reformation* (Duke University Press, Durham, NC, 1980), pp. 35–67, especially pp. 65–7.
83 See McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, pp. 141–7 for a discussion.

84 Ibid., pp. 95–136.

85 In *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, a study of the development of Luther's reforming theology over the period 1513–19, I pointed out how Luther's *theologia crucis* may be understood as the outcome of a theological program based upon Luther's insights into the nature of *iustitia Dei*. The origins of this program may be dated from 1515, and its conclusion in 1518–19.

86 McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, pp. 128–33; McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2nd edn., 1998), pp. 190–7.

87 See, e.g., Ebeling, "Anfänge von Luthers Hermeneutik," pp. 4–7.

88 For an excellent analysis, see Ebeling, "Anfänge von Luthers Hermeneutik," pp. 8–12.

89 *WA* 3.335.21–2; 531.33–5.

90 Cf. Holl, "Luthers Bedeutung für den Fortschritt der Auslegungskunst," p. 546:

> [Luther] *betont diesen Sinn so stark, daß er ihn auch als den sensus primarius scripturae bezeichnen kann. Dazu kommt aber noch: was Luther unter diesem Titel vorträgt, sind nicht einzelne zufällig herausgegriffene sittliche Weisungen, wie man sie nach jeweiligem Bedünken an den Text anschließen mochte, sondern etwas Einheitliches, scharf Umrissenes, immer wieder von ihm Eingeschärftes. Es ist kurz gesagt das paulinische Evangelium, was Luther als dem tropologischen Sinn aus den Psalmen herausholt.*

91 Ebeling, "Anfänge von Luthers Hermeneutik," pp. 66–8.

92 See, e.g., Ebeling, "Anfänge von Luthers Hermeneutik," p. 68: "*Das Schema des vierfachen Schriftsinnes ist von innen her zubrochen. Zunächst auf seine Angelpunkte reduziert: den sensus literalis propheticus und den sensus tropologicus, hat er sich zuletzt als in sich identisch erweisen.*"

93 For example, *Apol. Concl.* fol. A. 2v "*Praemissae conclusiones verae sunt, si dicta doctoris testimonium sanctum secundum litteralem sententiam suffragaretur*"; V. E. Löscher, *Vollständige Reformations-Acta und Documenta II: Aus das Jahr 1518* (Johann Grossen, Leipzig, 1723), pp. 80–1. Cf. his comments on Augustine's *de spiritu et litera*: "*vidi, legi et relegi illum textum, ad literam autem legere hoc nequivi*"; Ernst Kähler, *Karlstadt und Augustin: Der Kommentar des Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt zu Augustins Schrift "De spiritu et litera"* (Martin Niemeyer, Halle, 1952), 102.12–13.

94 For example, Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, Ia q. 1 a. 10 ad 1um: "*Et ita etiam nulla confusio sequitur in sacra scriptura: cum omnes sensus fundentur super unum, scilicet literalem; ex qua solo potest trahi argumentum, non autem ex his quae secundum allegoriam dicuntur.*"

95 *Apol. Concl.* fol. A 3r: "*sed eum, qui ad verbum seil verbi significationem accipitur, litteralem dicimus.*"

96 Ulrich Bubenheimer, *Consonantia Theologiae et Iurisprudentiae: Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt als Theologe und Jurist zwischen Scholastik und Reformation* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1977), pp. 126–37.

97 *Apol. Concl.* fol. A 2v; Löscher, *Reformations-Acta*, p. 81: "*Contra Gers*[on] *negamus, esse sensum litteralem, qui ex intentione, et circumstantiis scribentis colligitur*"; Cf. Gerson's

principle, "*Est autem sensus literalis non solum grammaticalis, sed nec stricte logicalis; verum ille quem Spiritus sanctus principaliter intendebat, qui ex circumstantia literae, cum causis dicendi et modis exponendi, magis patet.*" *Opera*, vol. 1, 11 D.

98 Bubenheimer, *Consonantia Theologiae et Iurisprudentiae*, pp. 130–3.

99 Luther uses (or, more accurately, invents) the verb *wittenbergescere* to refer to this theology: *WABr* 12.16.6–9.

100 Later Lutheran hermeneutics moved away from such scholastic models. It is especially instructive to consider the hermeneutical approach of Matthias Flacius (1520–79), which stresses the parallels between the Bible and humanist classics. Flacius argues that the Bible adopts the asyndectic, asymmetrical harshness typical of the Thucydidean grand style, and is richly laden with "similitudes, allegories, types" and other literary figures, demanding modes of interpretation directly equivalent to their classical counterparts. See D. J. Shuger, *Sacred Rhetoric: The Christian Grand Style in the English Renaissance* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1988).

Chapter 6

1 See especially the essays collected together as Leif Grane, Alfred Schindler, and Markus Wriedt, *Auctoritas patrum: Beiträge zur Rezeption der Kirchenväter im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Philipp von Zabern, Mainz, 1993); *Auctoritas patrum II: Neue Beiträge zur Rezeption der Kirchenväter im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Philipp von Zabern, Mainz, 1998).

2 David C. Steinmetz, *Misericordia Dei: The Thought of Johannes von Staupitz in its Late Medieval Setting* (Brill, Leiden, 1968), p. 33: "All medieval theologians, even the most Pelagian, were indebted to the great father of western theology for many of their ideas. All medieval theologians are, in some measure at least, Augustinian theologians. The question is not whether a theologian is indebted to Augustine but rather what is the degree and nature of his indebtedness."

3 *Monologion*, prologue: "*Quam ego saepe retractans nihil potui invenire me in ea dixisse, quod non catholicorum patrum et maxime beati Augustini scriptis cohaereat.*"

4 See D. M. Cappuyns, "Le premier représentant de l'Augustinisme médiévale," *RThAM* 1 (1929), 309–37. On the practice of collecting such "sentences," see Marcia Colish, "The Sentence Collection and the Education of Professional Theologians in the Twelfth Century," in Nancy van Deusen (ed.), *The Intellectual Climate of the Early University* (Medieval Institute Publications Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI, 1997), pp. 1–26.

5 This is particularly evident in relation to the doctrine of justification, one of the areas of theology to be most exhaustively discussed in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries: see Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2nd edn, 1998). More generally, see M. D. Chenu, *La théologie au XIIe siècle* (Vrin, Paris, 1957); J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique de XIIe siècle* (Culture et Civilization, Brussels, 2nd edn, 1969). On the twelfth-century renaissance in general, see G. Pare, A. Brunet, and P. Tremblay, *La renaissance du XIIe siècle* (Vrin, Paris, 1933).

6 Witness Thomas Aquinas's difficulties with the concepts: McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 103–8.
7 For a useful introduction to this process, see H. Cloes, "La systematisation théologique pendant la premiere moitié du XIIe siècle," *EThL* 34 (1958), 277–329.
8 McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 109–14.
9 M. de Kroon, "Pseudo-Augustin im Mittelalter: Entwurf eines Forschungberichts," *Augustiniana* 22 (1972), 511–30.
10 Note the views of Hincmar of Reims and Florus of Lyons: McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 131–2. For a detailed study, see J. E. Chisholm, *The Pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon against the Pelagians* (University Press, Fribourg, 1967). On the problem in general, see Pierre-Patrick Verbraken, *Études critiques sur les sermons authentiques de saint Augustin* (Abbaye de Saint Pierre, Steenbrugis, 1976).
11 R. Evans, "Pelagius, Fastidius and the Pseudo-Augustinian *De vita Christiana*," *Journal of Theological Studies* 13 (1962), 72–98.
12 C. Fantini, "Il trattato pseudo-agostiniana *De vera et falsa poenitentia*," *Ricerche di storia religiosa* 1 (1954–7), 200–9.
13 Heiko A. Oberman, *Werden und Wertung der Reformation* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1977), p. 87.
14 Ibid., 91–3.
15 Damasus Trapp, "Augustinian Theology of the Fourteenth Century: Notes on Editions, Marginalia, Opinions and Book-Lore," *Augustiniana* 6 (1956), 146–274, especially pp. 188–9.
16 Andreas de Vega, *Opusculum de iustificatione, gratia et meritis* (Venice, 1546), fol. 147. Note also the accompanying reference to Bradwardine.
17 Bradwardine, *De causa Dei* (London, 1618), I, 35; fol. 311 B-C.
18 See, for example, their appreciative citation from *de civitate dei*: Alfred Schindler, "Augustins Werk *De Civitate Dei* bei den Reformatoren, vor allem Luther und Zwingli," in J. van Oort (ed.), *De Kerkvaders in Reformatie en Nadere Reformatie* (Boekencentrum, Zoetermeer, 1997), pp. 35–44.
19 Note Luther's famous remarks of 1535: "*Papa, ego voli tibi osculari pedes teque agnoscere summum pontificem, si adoraveris Christum meum et permiseris, quod per ipsius mortem et resurrectionem habeamus remissionem peccatorum et vitam aeternam, non per observationem tuarum traditionum. Si hoc cesseris, non adimam tibi coronam et potentiam tuam*" (*WA* 40 1.357.18–22). For a careful study of Luther's attitude to the papacy and schism over the crucial period 1517–20, see Scott H. Hendrix, *Luther and the Papacy: Stages in a Reformation Conflict* (Fortress, Philadelphia, 1981).
20 Benjamin B. Warfield, *Calvin and Augustine* (Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Philadelphia, 1956), p. 322.
21 See Joseph de Ghellinck, "La première edition imprimée des *Opera omnia S. Augustini*," in *Miscellanea J. Gessler I* (Govaerts, Antwerp, 1948), pp. 530–47. The spelling "Amorbach" is occasionally encountered.

Augustin dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin, pp. 265–70, with valuable documentation. This has now been supplanted by J. M. J. Lange van Ravenswaay, *Augustinus totus noster: Das Augustinverständnis bei Johannes Calvin* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1990). More generally, see the useful analysis of A. N. S. Lane, *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers* (T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1999).

38 Smits, *Saint Augustin dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin*, pp. 17–24, 261.

39 After an exhaustive analysis of Calvin's citations from patristic sources, it can only be concluded that Calvin searched out and tabulated his own patristic citations, rather that relying on existing collections of "sentences": Lane, *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers*, pp. 47–9.

40 See Hans-Ulrich Delius, *Augustin als Quelle Martin Luthers* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1984). For the older literature, see A. Hamel, *Der junge Luther und Augustin* (2 vols, Gerd Mohn, Gütersloh, 1934–5), vol. 1, 5–25; Bernhard Lohse, "Die Bedeutung Augustins für den jungen Luther," *Kerygma und Dogma* 11 (1965), 116–35; Leif Grane, "Augustins 'Expositio quarundam propositionum ex epistola ad Romanos' in Luthers Römerbriefvorlesung," *ZThK* 69 (1972), 304–30; Leif Grane, "Divus Paulus et S. Augustinus, interpres eius fidelissimus: Über Luthers Verhältnis zu Augustin," in G. Ebeling, E. Jüngel, and G. Schunack (eds.), *Festschrift für Ernst Fuchs* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1973), pp. 133–46. According to Friedensburg, a large collection of patristic texts was available at Wittenberg from 1513: W. Friedensburg, *Geschichte der Universität Wittenberg* (Niemeyer, Halle, 1917), p. 154.

41 *WA* 9.44.1–4.

42 For example, *WA* 56.385.15–22 (note the explicit reference to Augustine). See further Alister E. McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross: Martin Luther's Theological Breakthrough* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1985), pp. 128–32.

43 *WA* 54.185.12–186.21. English translation in McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, pp. 95–8.

44 Cf. *WA* 56.36.11; 172.5. See further McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, pp. 132–3. Cf. C. Boyer, "Luther et le 'De spiritu et litera' de Saint Augustin," *Doctor Communis* 21 (1968), 167–87; Leif Grane, *Modus loquendi theologicus: Luthers Kampf um die Erneuerung der Theologie (1515–1518)* (Brill, Leiden, 1975), pp. 65–6.

45 This has been pointed out elsewhere: e.g., see the six points of difference set out in McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 204–5. Earlier studies tended to suggest that Luther's concept was essentially identical with that of Augustine.

46 For Augustine, there was an essential continuity between *iustitia Dei* and *iustitia humana*: see McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 35–6; P. A. Schubert, *Augustins Lex-Aeterna-Lehre nach Inhalt und Quellen* (Aschendorff, Münster, 1924).

47 McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 206–7. The concept of *iustitia Christi aliena* is of particular importance in this respect.

48 See the analysis of Karl-Heinz zur Mühlen, "Die *auctoritas patrum* in Martin Luthers Schrift 'Von den Konziliis und Kirchen' (1539)," in *Auctoritas Patrum II*, 141–52. This should be supplemented with Christa Tecklenburg Johns, *Luthers Konzilsidee in ihrer historischen Bedingtheit und ihrem reformatorischen Neuansatz* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1966).

49 *WA* 50.524.13–18.
50 Ibid., 9.4 no. 13.
51 Luther appears to have consulted the eighth volume of this edition in 1516: *WABr* 1.70.12.
52 Luther's gleeful recollection of this event is contained in a letter of the following month: *WABr* 1.65.24–5 "*Est enim . . . nihil ab Augustini eruditione et sensu remotius.*"
53 For Luther's comments, see *WABr* 1.65.29–66.1.
54 Kähler, *Karlstadt und Augustin*, 69.27–31 "*Non est sensus, quod illa iusticia dei sit per legem testificatam qua deus in se iustus est, sed illa, qua iustificat impium, qua induit hominem, qua instaurat imaginem dei in homine; de hac iusticia, qua deus suos electos iustos et pios efficit, tractamus.*" Cf. 55.32–56.2.
55 See McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, 207–9 for a full discussion. The suggestion of Ronald J. Sider, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt: The Development of his Thought 1517–1525* (Brill, Leiden, 1974), pp. 67–8, 122–5, 258–9, that Karlstadt's doctrine of justification is *forensic* at this point, is to be rejected as resting upon confusion concerning what the term "forensic" actually means.
56 *WABr* 1.99.8–13.
57 See Steinmetz, *Misericordia Dei*, pp. 75–92 for an analysis of the work.
58 Oberman, *Werden und Wertung der Reformation*, pp. 98–102.
59 The oration of 1519 is particularly informative concerning Melanchthon's views on this matter: *CR* (Melanchthon) 11.32.
60 The function of the *testimonia patrum* within the context of Melanchthon's reforming theology has been carefully studied by Peter Fraenkel, *Testimonia Patrum: The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon* (Droz, Geneva, 1961). The relation of the substance of Melanchthon's theology to the patristic testimony has been analyzed by E. P. Meijering, *Melanchthon and Patristic Thought: The Doctrines of Christ and Grace, the Trinity and the Creation* (Brill, Leiden, 1983).
61 See Fraenkel, *Testimonia Patrum*, pp. 70–86, for a careful and well-documented study.
62 Ibid., pp. 86–93. Note how Melanchthon treats Origen as a precursor of Pelagius.
63 Ibid., pp. 93–6. Cf. *CR* (Melanchthon) 2.884: "*so man nun fragt, warum sondert ihr euch denn von der vorigen rechten Kirchen. Ich halte eben das, welches Ambrosius und Augustinus gelehret haben.*"
64 Thus Maria Grossmann, *Humanism in Wittenberg 1485–1517* (de Graaf, Nieuwkoop, 1975), treats the Wittenberg reforms as the logical outcome of the introduction of the *studia humanitatis* under Christoph Scheurl.
65 This point is developed elsewhere: McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, pp. 48–53.
66 Gottfried W. Locher, "Praedicatio verbi Dei est verbum Dei: Heinrich Bullinger zwischen Zwingli und Luther; Ein Beitrag zu seiner Theologie," *Zwingliana* 10 (1954), 47–57.
67 Gottfried W. Locher, "Von Bern nach Genf: Die Ursachen der Spannung zwischen zwinglischer und calvinistischer Reformation," in W. Balke, C. Graafland, and H. Harkema (eds.), *Wegen et Gestalten in het Gereformeerd Protestantisme* (Ton Bolland, Amsterdam, 1976), pp. 75–87.

Conclusion

1 I use this term deliberately, following Herbert Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter: Untersuchungen über die geschichtlichen Zusammenhänge zwischen der Ketzerei, den Bettelorden und der religiösen Frauenbewegung um 12. und 13. Jahrhundert und über die geschichtlichen Grundlagen der deutschen Mystik* (Emil Ebering, Berlin, 1935).

2 See Thomas A. Brady, *Turning Swiss: Cities and Empire, 1450–1550* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1985). For some examples of other local factors, see Oskar Vasella, *Reform und Reformation in der Schweiz: Zur Würdigung der Anfänge der Glaubenskrise* (Aschendorff, Münster, 1958); Berndt Moeller, Imperial Cities and the Reformation (Fortress, Philadelphia, 1972); Steven E. Ozment, *The Reformation in the Cities: The Appeal of Protestantism to Sixteenth-Century Germany and Switzerland* (Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 1975); R. W. Scribner, "Civic Unity and the Reformation in Erfurt," *Past and Present* 66 (1975), 29–60, "Why was there no Reformation at Cologne?" *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 49 (1976), 217–41; Thomas A. Brady, *Ruling Class, Regime and Reformation at Strasbourg, 1520–1555* (Brill, Leiden, 1977); Hans von Greyerz, *The Late City Reformation in Germany: The Case of Colmar* (Franz Steiner, Wiesbaden, 1980); Wilfried Ehbrecht, "Verlaufsformen innerstädtischer Konflicte in nord- und westdeutschen Städten im Reformationszeitalter," in B. Moeller (ed.), *Stadt und Kirche im 16. Jahrhundert* (Mohn, Gütersloh, 1976), pp. 27–47, "Köln, Osnabrück, Stralsund: Rat und Bürgerschaft hansischer Städte zwischen religiöser Erneuerung und Bauernkrieg," in F. Petri (ed.), *Kirche und gesellschaftlicher Wandel* (Bohlau, Cologne, 1980), pp. 23–64; Hans R. Guggisberg, *Basel in the Sixteenth Century: Aspects of the City Republic Before, During, and After the Reformation* (Center for Reformation Research, St Louis, MO, 1982); Martin Burkhardt, Wolfgang Dobras, and Wolfgang Zimmermann, *Konstanz in der frühen Neuzeit: Reformation, Verlust der Reichsfreiheit, österreichische Zeit* (Stadler, Constance, 1991); Rosi Fuhrmann, *Kirche und Dorf: Religiöse Bedürfnisse und kirchliche Stiftung auf dem Lande vor der Reformation* (Fischer, Stuttgart, 1995); Bruce Gordon, The Swiss Reformation (Manchester University Press, Manchester, UK, 2002).

3 G. W. Locher, "Von Bern nach Genf: Die Ursachen der Spannung zwischen zwinglischer und calvinistischer Reformation," in W. Balke, C. Graafland, and H. Harkema (eds.), *Wegen en Gestalten in het Gereformeerd Protestantisme* (Ton Bolland, Amsterdam, 1976), pp. 75–87.

Select Bibliography

Allen, M. J. B., "Marsilio Ficino on Plato, the Neoplatonists and the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity," *Renaissance Quarterly* 37 (1984), 555–84.

Ankwicz-Kleehoven, H., *Der Wiener Humanist Johannes Cuspinian, Gelehrter und Diplomat zur Zeit Kaiser Maximilians* (Graz, Bohlaus, 1959).

Augrain, C., "À propos du Comma Johanneum," *Moreana* 35 (1998), 87–94.

Augustijn, C., *Erasmus: Der Humanist als Theologe und Kirchenreformer* (Brill, Leiden, 1996).

Backus, I., *Les sept visions et la fin des temps: Les commentaires genevois de l'Apocalypse entre 1539 et 1584* (Droz, Geneva, 1997).

Backus, I., "Renaissance Attitudes to New Testament Apocryphal Writings: Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and his Epigones," *Renaissance Quarterly* 51 (1998), 1169–98.

Backus, I., *Reformation Readings of the Apocalypse: Geneva, Zurich, and Wittenberg* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000).

Bannach, K., *Die Lehre von der doppelten Macht Gottes bei Wilhelm von Ockham: Problemgeschichtliche Voraussetzungen und Bedeutung* (Steiner, Wiesbaden, 1975).

Barnett, M. J., "Erasmus and the Hermeneutics of Linguistic Praxis," *Renaissance Quarterly* 49 (1996), 542–72.

Baron, H., *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, revised edn., 1966).

Baron, H., "Leonardi Bruno: Professional Rhetorician' or Civic Humanist'?" *Past and Present* 36 (1967), 21–37.

Basse, M., "Theologiegeschichtsschreibung und Kontroverstheologie: Die Bedeutung der Scholastik für die protestantische Kirchengeschichtsschreibung," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 107 (1996), 50–71.

Battles, F. L., "God was Accommodating Himself to Human Capacity," *Interpretation* 31 (1977), 19–38.

Bauch, G., "Die Anfange des Studiums der griechischen Sprache und Literature in Nord-Deutschland," *Gesellschaft für deutsche Erziehungs- und Schulgeschichte* 6 (1896), 47–98.

Bauch, G., *Die Rezeption des Humanismus in Wien* (M. & H. Marcus, Breslau,1903).

Bauch, G., "Die Einführung des Hebräischen in Wittenberg mit Berücksichtigung der Vorgeschichte des Studiums der Sprache in Deutschland," *Monatschrift für Geschichte*

und Wissenschaft des Judentums 48 (1904), 22–32, 77–86, 145–60, 214–23, 283–99, 328–40, 461–90.

Bauer, K., *Die Wittenberger Universitätstheologie und die Anfänge der Deutschen Reformation* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1928).

Bäumer, R., "Die Reformkonzilien des 15. Jahrhunderts in der neueren Forschung," *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum* 1 (1969), 153–64.

Bäumer, R., "Die Zahl der allgemeinen Konzilien in der Sicht von Theologen des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts," *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum* 1 (1969), 288–313.

Bavaud, G., "L'attitude du réformateur Pierre Viret face à l'argument de prescription chez saint Augustin," *Revue des etudes augustiniennes* 26 (1980), 257–65.

Bavaud, G., *Le réformateur Pierre Viret (1511–1571): sa théologie* (Labor et Fides, Geneva, 1986).

Bayer, O., *Promissio: Geschichte der reformatorischen Wende in Luthers Theologie* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1971).

Bedouelle, G., *Lefèvre d'Etaples et l'intelligence des écritures* (Droz, Geneva, 1976).

Benin, S. D., *The Footprints of God: Divine Accommodation in Jewish and Christian Thought* (State University of New York Press, Albany, NY, 1993).

Bennett, M. J., "Erasmus and the Hermeneutics of Biblical Practice," *Renaissance Quarterly* 49 (1996), 542–72.

Bentley, J. H., "Erasmus' *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum* and the Textual Criticism of the Gospels," *ARG* 67 (1976), 33–53.

Bermon, P., "La *Lectura* sur les deux premiers livres des Sentences de Grégoire de Rimini O.E.S.A. (1300–1358)", in G. R. Evans (ed.), *Medieval Commentaries on Peter Lombard's Sentences* (2 vols, Brill, Leiden, 2001), vol. 1, pp. 267–85.

Bernstein, E., *Die Literatur des deutschen Frühhumanismus* (Metzler, Stuttgart, 1978).

Bernstein, E., "From Outsiders to Insiders: Some Reflections on the Development of a Group Identity of the German Humanists between 1450 and 1530," in C. G. Nauert and J. V. Mehl (eds.), *In laudem Caroli: Renaissance and Reformation studies for Charles G. Nauert* (Sixteenth Century Publishers, Kirksville, MO, 1998), pp. 45–64.

Bietenholz, P., *Der italienische Humanismus und die Blütezeit des Buchdrucks in Basel* (Helbing & Lichtenhahn, Basle, 1959).

Billanovich, G., "Petrarch and the Textual Tradition of Livy," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute* 14 (1951), 137–208.

Birnbaum, N., "The Zwinglian Reformation in Zurich," *Past and Present* 15 (1959), 27–47.

Boisset, J., *Sagesse et sainteté dans la pensée de Jean Calvin* (Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1959).

Bolliger, D., "Infiniti Contemplatio: Grundzüge der Scotus- und Scotismusrezeption im Werk Huldrych Zwinglis," PhD Thesis. University of Zurich, 2000.

Bonorand, C., *Vadians Weg vom Humanismus zur Reformation und seine Vorträge über die Apostelgeschichte* (Vadian-Studien 7, Verlag der Fehr'schen Buchhandlung, St Gallen, 1962).

Bonorand, C., "Die Bedeutung der Universität Wien für Humanismus und Reformation, insbesondere in der Ostschweiz," *Zwingliana* 12 (1964–8), 162–80.

Bonorand, C., *Aus Vadians Freundes- und Schülerkreis in Wien* (Vadian-Studien 8, Verlag der Fehr'schen Buchhandlung, St Gallen, 1965).

Bonorand, C., "Joachim Vadians Beziehungen zu Ungarn," *Zwingliana* 13 (1969), 97–131.

Bonorand, C., "Joachim Vadian und Johannes Dantiscus: Ein Beitrag zu den schweizerisch-polnischen Beziehungen im 16. Jahrhundert," *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ermlands* 35 (1971), 150–70.

Bonorand, C., *Vadian und die Ereignisse in Italien im ersten Drittel des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Vadian-Studien 13, Verlag der Fehr'schen Buchhandlung, St Gallen, 1985).

Borchert, E., *Der Einfluß des Nominalismus der Spätscholastik nach dem Traktat de communicatione idiomatum des Nikolaus Oresme* (Aschendorff, Münster, 1940).

Bornert, R., *La réforme protestante du culte à Strasbourg au XVIe siècle (1523–1598): approche sociologique et interprétation théologique* (Brill, Leiden, 1981).

Bouwsma, W. J., "The Two Faces of Humanism: Stoicism and Augustinianism in Renaissance Thought," in H. A. Oberman with T. A. Brady (eds.), *Itinerarium Italicum: The Profile of the Italian Renaissance in the Mirror of its European Transformations* (Brill, Leiden, 1975), pp. 3–60.

Boyer, C., "Luther et le 'De spiritu et litera' de Saint Augustin," *Doctor Communis* 21 (1968), 167–87.

Boyle, L. E., "Innocent III and Vernacular Versions of Scripture," in K. Walsh and D. Wood (eds.), *The Bible in the Medieval World* (Studies in Church History, Subsidia 4, Blackwell, Oxford, 1985), pp. 131–55.

Branca, V., "Ermolao Barbaro and Late Quattrocento Venetian Humanism," in J. R. Hale (ed.), *Renaissance Studies* (Humana Press, Totowa, NJ, 1973), pp. 218–43.

Breen, Q., *John Calvin: A Study in French Humanism* (Archon Books, Hamden, CT, 2nd edn., 1968).

Brown, A. D., *Popular Piety in Late Medieval England: The Diocese of Salisbury, 1250–1550* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1995).

Bubenheimer, U., *Consonantia Theologiae et Iurisprudentiae: Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt als Theologe und Jurist zwischen Scholastik und Reformation* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1977).

Buechler, E. *Die Anfänge des Buchdrucks in der Schweiz* (Schweizerisches Gutenbergmuseum, Berne, 2nd edn, 1951).

Bunte, W., *Rabbinische Traditionen bei Nikolaus von Lyra: Ein Beitrag zur Schriftauslegung des Spätmittelalters* (Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, 1994).

Burger, H. O., *Renaissance, Reformation, Humanismus: Deutsche Literatur im europäischen Kontext* (Verlag Gehlen, Bad Homburg, 1969).

Cadier, J., "Le prétendu stoïcisme de Calvin," *Etudes théologiques et religieuses* 41 (1966), 217–26.

Cadier, J., "Le conversion de Calvin," *Bulletin de la société de l'histoire du protestantisme français* 116 (1970), 142–51.

Caleo, M., *Verità e certezza della donazione di Costantino: polemica con Lorenzo Valla* (Ler, Naples, 1990).

Camporeale, S. I., *Lorenzo Valla: umanesimo e teologia* (Istituto Palazzo Strozzi, Florence, 1972).

Cantimori, D., "Sulla storia del concetto di Rinascimento," *Annali della scuola normale superiore di Pisa: lettere, storia e filosophia*, 2nd series, 1 (1932), 229–68.

Celenza, C. S., "Renaissance Humanism and the New Testament: Lorenzo Valla's Annotations to the Vulgate," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 24 (1994), 33–52.

Cervani, G., "Il Rinascimento italiano nella interpretazione di Hans Baron," *Nuova rivista storica* 39 (1955), 492–503.

Chomorat, V, "Les *Annotations* de Valla, celles de Erasme et la grammaire," in O. Fatio and P. Fraenkel (eds.), *Histoire de l'exégèse au XVIe siècle* (Droz, Geneva, 1978), pp. 202–28.

Christ, C., "Das Schriftverständnis von Zwingli und Erasmus im Jahre 1522," *Zwingliana* 16 (1983), 111–25.

Cohen, J., *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism* (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY, 1982).

Coogan, R., *Erasmus, Lee and the Correction of the Vulgate: The Shaking of the Foundations* (Droz, Geneva, 1992).

Courtenay, W. J., "Covenant and Causality in Pierre d'Ailly," *Speculum* 46 (1971), 94–119.

Courtenay, W. J., "The King and the Leaden Coin: The Economic Background to Sine Qua Non Causality," *Traditio* 28 (1972), 185–209.

Courtenay, W. J., "Nominalism and Late Medieval Thought: A Bibliographical Essay," *Theological Studies* 33 (1972), 716–34.

Courtenay, W. J., "John of Mirecourt and Gregory of Rimini on Whether God can undo the Fast," *RThAM* 39 (1972), 224–56, 40 (1973), 147–74.

Courtenay, W. J., "Nominalism and Late Medieval Religion," in C. Trinkaus and H. A. Ùberman (eds.), *The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion* (Brill, Leiden, 1974), pp. 26–59.

Courtenay, W. J., *Adam Wodeham: An lntroduction to his Life and Writings* (Brill, Leiden,1977).

Courtenay, W. J., "Late Medieval Nominalism Revisited: 1972–1982," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 44 (1983), 159–64.

Courvoisier, J., *De la Réforme au Protestantisme: essai d'ecclesiologie réformé* (Beauchesne, Paris, 1977).

Cross, R. A., *The Metaphysics of Incarnation: Thomas Aquinas to Duns Scotus* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002).

Csaky, M., "Die Sodalitas litteraria Danubiana: Historische Realität oder poetistche Fiktion des Conrad Celtis?" in H. Zeman (ed.), *Die österreichische Literatur: Ihr Profil von den Anfängen im Mittelalter bis zum 18. Jahrhundert* (Bohlaus, Graz, 1985), pp. 739–85.

Dahan, G., "Les interprétations juives dans les commentaries du Pentateuch de Pierre le Chantre," in D. Wood and K. Walsh (eds.), *The Bible in the Medieval World* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1985), pp. 131–55.

Dahan, G., *Les intellectuels chrétiens et les juifs au moyen âge* (Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1990).

Dahan, G., *La polémique chrétienne contre le judaïsme au Moyen Âge* (Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1991).

D'Amico, J. F., *Theory and Practice in Renaissance Textual Criticism: Beatus Rhenanus Between Conjecture and History* (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, 1988).

Del Fra, M., "Linguaggio e conoscenza assertiva nel pensiero di Roberto Holkot," *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia* 11 (1956), 15–40.

Del Fra, M., "La teoria del 'significato totale' delle propositione nel pensiero di Gregorio da Rimini," *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia* 11 (1956), 287–311.

Delius, H.-U., *Augustin als Quelle Martin Luthers* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1984).

Dettloff, W., *Die Lehre von der Acceptatio Divina bei Johannes Duns Scotus mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Rechtfertigungslehre* (Dietrich Coelde Verlag, Werl, 1954).

Dettloff, W., *Die Entwicklung der Akzeptations und Verdienstlehre von Duns Skotus bis Luther* (Aschendorff, Münster, 1963).

Donati, S., "La dottrina di Egidio Romano sulla materia dei corpi celesti. Discussioni sulla natura dei corpi celesti alla fine del tredicesimo secolo," *Medioevo* 12 (1986), 229–80.

Donnelly, J. P., *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace* (Brill, Leiden, 1976).

Ebeling, G., "Die Anfänge von Luthers Hermeneutik," in *Lutherstudien I* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1971), pp. 1–68.

Eckermann, W., *Wort und Wirklichkeit: Das Sprachverständnis in der Theologie Gregors von Rimini und seine Weiterwirkung in der Augustinerschule* (Augustinus-Verlag, Würzburg, 1978).

Edelstein, M. M., "Les origines sociales de l'épiscopat sous Louis XII et François I," *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* 24 (1977), 239–47.

Egli, E., "Zur Einführung des Schriftprinzips in der Schweiz," *Zwingliana* 1 (1903), 332–9.

Ehrle, F., *Der Sentenzenkommentar Peters von Candia des Pisaner Papstes Alexanders V: Ein Beitrag zur Scheidung der Schulen in der Scholastik des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts und zur Geschichte des Wegestreits* (Aschendorff, Münster, 1925).

Eib, M., *Der Humanismus und sein Einfluss auf das Eheverständnis im 15. Jahrhundert: Eine philosophisch-moraltheologische Untersuchung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des frühhumanistischen Gedankenguts Albrechts von Eyb* (LIT Verlag, Münster, 2001).

Eisenbichler, K., *Crossing the Boundaries: Christian Piety and the Arts in Italian Medieval and Renaissance Confraternities* (Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI, 1991).

Eisenstein, E. L., *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change* (2 vols, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1979).

Elm, K., "Verfall und Erneuerung des Ordenswesen in Spätmittelalter," in *Untersuchungen zu Kloster und Stift* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1980), pp. 188–238.

Elm, K., "Die Bruderschaft von gemeinsamen Leben: Eine geistliche Lebensform zwischen Kloster und Welt, Mittelalter und Neuzeit," *Ons geestelijk Erf* 59 (1985), 470–96.

Engels, O., "Zur Konstanzer Konzilsproblematik in der nachkonziliaren Historiographie des 15. Jahrhunderts," in R. Bäumer (ed.), *Von Konstanz nach Trient: Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte von den Reformkonzilien bis zum Tridentinum* (Schoningh, Paderborn, 1972), pp. 233–59.

Entner, H., "Probleme der Forschung zum deutschen Frühhumanismus 1400–1500," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Emst-Moritz-Amdt-Universität Greifswald* 15 (1966), 587–90.

Erler, M. C., *Women, Reading, and Piety in Late Medieval England* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2002).

Etienne, J., *Spiritualisme érasmien et théologiens louvainistes: un changement de problématique au début du XVIe siècle* (Publications universitaires de Louvain, Louvain/Gembloux, 1956).

Evans, G. R., *The Language and Logic of the Bible: The Earlier Middle Ages* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1984).

Evans, G. R., *The Language and Logic of the Bible: The Road to Reformation* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1985).

Farge, J. K., "Early Censorship of Printed Books in Paris: New Insights and Perspectives," in J. M. de Bujanda (ed.), *Le contrôle des idées à la Renaissance* (Droz, Geneva, 1996), pp. 75–91.

Fatio, O., *Méthode et théologie: Lambert Daneau et les débuts de la scolastique réformée* (Droz, Geneva, 1976).

Feld, H., *Martin Luthers und Wendelin Steinbachs Vorlesungen über den Hebräerbrief. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der neutestamentlichen Exegese und Theologie* (Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1971).

Feld, H., *Die Anfänge der modernen biblischen Hermeneutik in der spätmittelalterlichen Theologie* (Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1977).

Ferguson, W. K., *The Renaissance in Historical Thought: Five Centuries of Interpretation* (Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1948).

Fiedrowicz, M., *Prinzipien der Schriftauslegung in der Alten Kirche* (Peter Lang, Bern, 1998).

Fiume, E., "*Decretum Dei, solatium ineffabile*: il contributo di Girolamo Zanchi (1516–1590) alla dottrina della doppia predestinazione e della perseveranza dei credenti," *Bollettino della Societa di Studi Valdesi* 114 (1997), 67–78.

Fraenkel, P., *Testimonia Patrum: The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon* (Droz, Geneva, 1961).

Friedensburg, W., *Urkundenbuch der Universität Wittenberg I: (1502–1611)* (Selbstverlag der Historischen Kommission, Magdeburg, 1926).

Friedrich, M., *Von Marburg bis Leuenberg: Der lutherisch-reformierte Gegensatz und seine Überwindung* (Spenner, Waltrup, 1999).

Friemel, S., *Die theologische Prinzipienlehre des Augustinus Favaroni von Rom, O.E.S.A. (1443)* (Augustinus Verlag, Würzburg, 1950).

Gabriel, A. L., "'Via Antiqua' and 'Via Moderna' and the Migration of Paris Students and Masters to the German Universities in the Fifteenth Century,", in A. Zimmermann (ed.), *Antiqui und Moderni: Traditionsbewußtsein und Fortschrittbewußtsein im späten Mittelalter* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, 1974), pp. 439–83

Gaeta, F., *Lorenzo Valla: filologia e storia nell'umanesimo* (Napoli Istituto Italiano per gli studi storici, Naples, 1955).

Gal, G., "Adam of Wodeham's Question on the 'Complexe Significabile' as the Immediate Object of Scientific Knowledge," *FcS* 37 (1977), 66–102.

Ganoczy, A., *Le jeune Calvin: génèse et évolution de sa vocation réformatrice* (Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1966).

Garin, E., "Le traduzioni umanistische di Aristotele nel secolo XV," *Atti e memorie dell'accademia fiorentini di scienze morali, "La Columbaria"* 16 (1951), 55–104.

Geanokoplos, D., "The Discourse of Demetrius Chalcondyles on the Inauguration of Greek Studies at the University of Padua in 1463," *Studies in the Renaissance* 21 (1974), 119–44.

Gelder, H. A. E. van, *The Two Reformations in the 16th Century: A Study of the Religious Aspects and Consequences of the Renaissance and Humanism* (Martinus Nijhof, The Hague, 1961).

Ghellinck, J. de, "La première édition imprimée des *Opera omnia S. Augustini*," in *Miscellanea J. Gessler* (Govaerts, Antwerp, 1948), pp. 530–47.

Gilbert, N. W., "Ockham, Wyclif and the 'Via Moderna,'" in A. Zimmerman (ed.), *Antiqui et Moderni: Traditionsbewußtsein and Fortschrittbewußtsein im späten Mittelalter* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1974), pp. 85–125.

Girardin, B., *Rhétorique et théologique: Calvin, le commentaire de l'epître aux Romains* (Éditions Beauchesne, Paris, 1979).

Godin, A., *Le homélaire de Jean Vitrier: spiritualité franciscaine en Flandre au XVIe siècle* (Droz, Geneva, 1971).

Goewens, K., "Ciceronianism and Collective Identity: Defining the Boundaries of the Roman Academy, 1525," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 23 (1993), 173–95.

Goldstein, J., *Nominalismus und Moderne: Zur Konstitution neuzeitlicher Subjektivität bei Hans Blumenberg und Wilhelm von Ockham* (Alber, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1998).

Gössmann, E., *Antiqui und Moderni im Mittelalter: Eine geschichtliche Standortsbestimmung* (Schoningh, Munich/Paderborn, 1974).

Goeters, J. F. G., "Zwinglis Werdegang als Erasmianer," in M. Greschat und J. F. G. Goeters (eds.), *Reformation und Humanismus: Robert Stupperich zum 65. Geburtstag* (Luther Verlag, Witten, 1969), pp. 255–71.

Grabmann, M., "Johannes Capreolus O. P., Der 'Princeps Thomistarum,' und seine Stellung in der Geschichte der Thomistenschule," in L. Ott (ed.), *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben III* (Hueber, Munich, 1956), pp. 370–410.

Graham, R. H., "Erasmus and Stunica: A Chapter in the History of New Testament Scholarship," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 10 (1990), 9–60.

Granada, M. A., Y. C. Zarka, and G. Canziani, *Potentia Dei: l'onnipotenza divina nel pensiero dei secoli XVIe XVII* (Angeli, Milan, 2000).

Grane, L., *Contra Gabrielem: Luthers Auseinandersetzung mit Gabriel Biel in der Disputatio contra scholasticam theologiam 1517* (Gyldendal, Copenhagen, 1962).

Grane, L., "Gregor von Rimini und Luthers Leipziger Disputation," *Studia Theologica* 22 (1968), 29–49.

Grane, L., "Augustins 'Expositio quarundam propositionum ex epistola ad Romanos' in Luthers Römerbriefvorlesung," *ZThK* 69 (1972), 304–30.

Grane, L., "Divus Paulus et S. Augustinus, interpres eius fidelissimus: Über Luthers Verhältnis zu Augustin," in G. Ebeling, E. Jüngel, and G. Schunack (eds.), *Festschrift für Ernst Fuchs* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1973), pp. 133–46.

Grane, L., *Modus loquendi theologicus: Luthers Kampf um die Erneuerung der Theologie (1515–1518)* (Brill, Leiden, 1975).

Gravalle, S. S., "Lorenzo Valla's Comparison of Latin and Greek and the Humanist Background," *BHR* 44 (1982), 269–89.

Gray, H. H., "Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence," in P. O. Kristeller and P. P. Wiener (eds.), *Renaissance Essays* (Harper & Row, New York, 1968), pp. 199–216.

Greschat, M., "Die Anfange der reformatorischen Theologie Martin Bucers," in M. Greschat and J. F. G. Goeters (eds.), *Reformation und Humanismus: Robert Stupperich zum 65. Geburtstag* (Luther Verlag, Witten, 1969), pp. 124–40.

Greschat, M., "Martin Bucers Bücherverzeichnis," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 57 (1975), 162–85.

Greschat, M., "Der Ansatz der Theologie Martin Bucers," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 103 (1978), 81–96.

Greyerz, H. von "Studien der Kulturgeschichte der Stadt Bern am Ende des Mittelalters," *Archiv des Historischen Vereins des Kantons Bern* 35 (1940), 175–491.

Grislis, E., "Calvin's Use of Cicero in the Institutes I: 1–5 – A Case Study in Theological Method," *ARG* 62 (1971), 5–37.

Grossmann, M., *Humanism in Wittenberg 1485–1517* (de Graaf, Nieuwkoop, 1975).

Gründler, O., *Die Gotteslehre Giralmo Zanchis und ihre Bedeutung für seine Lehre von der Prädestination* (Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen, 1965).

Grundmann, H., *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter: Untersuchungen über die geschichtlichen Zusammenhänge zwischen der Ketzerei, den Bettelorden und der religiösen Frauenbewegung um 12. und 13. Jahrhundert und über die geschichtlichen Grundlagen der deutschen Mystik* (Emil Ebering, Berlin, 1935).

Grundmann, H., *Ketzergeschichte des Mittelalters* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1963).

Guthmüller, V. (ed.), *Latein und Nationalsprachen in der Renaissance* (Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1998).

Haffter, H., "Vadian und die Universität Wien," *Wiener Geschichtsblätter* 20 (1965), 385–90.

Hageneder, O., "Der Häresiebegriff bei den Juristen des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts," in W. Lourdaux and D. Verhelst (eds.), *The Concept of Heresy in the Middle Ages* (Louvain University Press, Louvain, 1978), pp. 42–103.

Hägglund, B., "Martin Luther über die Sprache," *Neue Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie* 26 (1984), 1–12.

Halverson, J. L., *Peter Aureol on Predestination: A Challenge to Late Medieval Thought* (Brill, Leiden, 1998).

Hamm, B., *Promissio, Pactum, Ordinatio: Freiheit und Selbstbindung Gottes in der scholastischen Gnadenlehre* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1977).

Hargreaves, I., "The Wycliffite Versions," in *Cambridge History of the Bible* (3 vols, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1963–70), vol. 2, pp. 387–415.

Hargreaves, I., "Popularising Biblical Scholarship: The Role of the Wycliffite Glossed Gospels," in W. Lourdaux and D. Verhelst (eds.), *The Bible and Medieval Culture* (Louvain University Press, Louvain, 1979), pp. 171–89.

Harmening, D., "Faust und die Renaissance-Magie: Zum ältesten Faust-Zeugnis (Johannes Trithemius an Johannes Viridung, 1507)," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 55 (1973), 56–79.

Heller, D., *Schriftauslegung und geistliche Erfahrung bei Bernhard von Clairvaux* (Echter, Würzburg, 1990).

Heller, H., "The Evangelicalism of Lefèvre d'Etaples: 1525," *Studies in the Renaissance* 19 (1972), 42–77.

Heller, H., *The Conquest of Poverty: The Calvinist Revolt in Sixteenth-Century France* (Brill, Leiden, 1986).

Hermelink, H., *Die theologische Fakultät in Tübingen vor der Reformation 1477–1534* (Paul Siebeck, Tübingen, 1906).

Hildebrand, E., "Bartholomäus Arnoldi von Usingen: Ein Lehrer Luthers an der Universität Erfurt," *Nassauische Annalen* 94 (1983), 327–34.

Hobbs, M., Martin Bucer on Psalm 22: A Study in the Application of Rabbinical Exegesis by a Christian Hebraist," in Olivier Fatio and Pierre Fraenkel (eds.), *Histoire de l'exégèse au XVIe siècle* (Droz, Geneva, 1978), pp. 144–63.

Hobbs, M., "Monitio amica: Pellican à Capito sur le danger des lectures rabbiniques," in Marijn de Kroon and Marc Lienhard (eds.), *Horizons européens de la Réforme In Alsace* (Librairie Istra, Strasbourg, 1980), pp. 81–93.

Hoburg, R., *Seligkeit und Heilsgewissheit: Hermeneutik und Schriftauslegung bei Huldrych Zwingli bis 1522* (Calwer Verlag, Stuttgart, 1994).

Hochstetter, E., "Nominalismus?," *FcS* 9 (1949), 370–403.

Hoenen, M. J. F. M., *Marsilius of Inghen: Divine Knowledge in Late Medieval Thought* (Brill, Leiden, 1993).

Hoenen, M. J. F. M., and Paul J. J. M. Bakker, *Philosophie und Theologie des ausgehenden Mittelalters: Marsilius von Inghen und das Denken seiner Zeit* (Brill, Leiden, 2000).

Hoffmann, F., "Der Satz als Zeichen der theologischen Aussage bei Holcot, Crathorn und Gregor von Rimini," in *Der Begriff der Repräsentatio im Mittelalter* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1971), pp. 296–313.

Hoffmann, F., "Der Wandel in der scholastischen Argumentation von 13. zum 14. Jahrhundert, aufgezeigt an zwei Beispielen: Robert Holcot und William (Johannes?) Crathorn (1330–1332 in Oxford)," in A. Speer (ed.), *Die Bibliotheca Amploniana: Ihre Bedeutung im Spannungsfeld von Aristotelismus, Nominalismus und Humanismus* (De Gruyter, Berlin, 1995), pp. 301–22.

Hoffmann, M., *Erkenntnis und Verwirklichung der wahren Theologie nach Erasmus von Rotterdam* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1972).

Hoffmann, M., *Rhetoric and Theology: The Hermeneutic of Erasmus* (University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1994).

Holfelder, H. H., *Solus Christus: Die Ausbildung von Bugenhagens Rechtfertigungslehre in der Paulusauslegung (1524/25) und ihre Bedeutung* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1981).

Holl, K., "Luthers Bedeutung für den Fortschritt der Auslegungskunst," in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* (3 vols, Mohr, Tübingen, 7th edn, 1948), vol. 1, pp. 544–82.

Hurley, M. "*Scriptura Sola*: Wyclif and His Critics," *Traditio* 16 (1960), 275–352.

IJsewijn, J., The Coming of Humanism to the Low Countries," in H. A. Oberman and Thomas A. Brady (eds.), *Itinerarium Italicum* (Brill, Leiden, 1975), pp. 193–304.

Jackson, H. J., *Marginalia: Readers' Writing in Books* (Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 2001).

Janowski, H. N., *Geert Groote, Thomas von Kempen und die Devotio Moderna* (Walter Verlag, Olten,1978).

Janssen, H. E., *Gräfin Anna von Ostfriesland: Eine hochadelige Frau der späten Reformationszeit (1540/42–1575). Ein Beitrag zu den Anfängen der reformierten Konfessionalisierung im Reich* (Aschendorff, Münster, 1998).

Jedin, H., "Ein Turmerlebnis des jungen Contarinis," in *Kirche des Glaubens – Kirche der Geschichte: Ausgewählte Aufsätze und Vorträge I* (Herder Verlag, Freiburg, 1966), pp. 167–90.

Jonge, H. J. de, "*Novum Testamentum a nobis versum*: The Essence of Erasmus' Edition of the New Testament," *Journal of Theological Studies* 35 (1984), 394–400.

Junghans, H., "Der Einfluß des Humanismus auf Luthers Entwicklung bis 1518," *Luther-Jahrbuch* 37 (1970), 37–101.

Junghans, H., *Der junge Luther und die Humanisten* (Mohr, Göttingen, 1985).

Kähler, E., *Karlstadt und Augustin: Der Kommentar des Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt zu Augustins Schrift "De Spiritu et Litera"* (Martin Niemeyer, Halle, 1952).

Kaluza, Z., *Les querelles doctrinales à Paris: nominalistes et réalistes aux confins du XIVe et du XVe siècles* (Lubrina, Bergamo, 1988).

Kamerick, K., *Popular Piety and Art in the Late Middle Ages: Image Worship and Idolatry in England, 1350–1500* (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2002).

Karant-Nunn, S. C., "Turning New Leaves: Renaissance Studies in Germany," *Renaissance Quarterly* (1996), 114–23.

Karger, E., "Ockham's Misunderstood Theory of Intuitive and Abstractive Cognition," in P. V. Spade (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ockham* ed. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1999), pp. 204–26.

Kaufmann, T., *Universität und lutherische Konfessionalisierung: Die Rostocker Theologieprofessoren und ihr Beitrag zur theologischen Bildung und kirchlichen Gestaltung im Herzogtum Mecklenburg zwischen 1550 und 1675* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Gütersloh, 1997).

Kingdom, R. M., "Was the Protestant Reformation a Revolution? The Case of Geneva," in R. M. Kingdom (ed.), *Transition and Revolution: Problems of European Renaissance and Reformation History* (Burgess, Minneapolis, 1974), pp. 53–107.

Kisch, G., *Humanismus und Jurisprudenz: Der Kampf zwischen mos italicus und mos gallicus an der Universität Basel* (Helbing & Lichtenhahn, Basle, 1955).

Kisch, G., "Forschungen zur Geschichte des Humanismus in Basel," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 40 (1958), 194–221.

Kittelson, J. M., *Wolfgang Capito: From Humanist to Reformer* (Brill, Leiden, 1975).

Klibansky, R., *The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition during the Middle Ages* (Kraus, Munich, 1981).

Koch, K., *Studium Pietatis: Martin Bucer als Ethiker* (Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen, 1962).

Köhler, W., *Huldrych Zwinglis Bibliothek* (Kommissionsverlag Beer, Zurich, 1921).

Köhler, W., "Die Randglossen Zwinglis zum Römerbrief in seiner Abschrift der paulinischen Briefe 1516/17," in *Forschungen zur Kirchengeschichte und zur christlichen Kunst: Johannes Ficker als Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht* (Dieterich, Leipzig, 1931), pp. 86–106.

Kolb, R., "The Ordering of the *Loci Communes Theologici*: The Structuring of the Melanchthonian Dogmatic Tradition," *Concordia Journal* 23 (1997), 317–37.

Kristeller, P. O., "Renaissance Aristotelianism," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 6 (1965), 157–74.

Kristeller, P. O., "The European Diffusion of Italian Humanism," in *Renaissance Thought II: Humanism and the Arts* (Harper, New York, 1965), pp. 69–88.

Kristeller, P. O., *La tradizione aristotelica nel Rinascimento* (Antenore, Padua, 1972).

Kristeller, P. O., *Renaissance Thought and its Sources* (Columbia University Press, New York, 1979).

Kristeller, P. O., *Aristotelismo e sincretismo nel pensiero di Pietro Pomponazzi* (Antenore, Padua, 1983).

Kroon, M. de, "Pseudo-Augustin im Mittelalter: Entwurf eines Forschungberichts," *Augustiniana* 22 (1972), 511–30.

Kropatschek, F., *Das Schriftprinzip der lutherischen Kirche I: Die Vorgeschichte: Das Erbe des Mittelalters* (Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig, 1904).

Krüger, F., *Bucer und Erasmus: Eine Untersuchung zum Einfluß des Erasmus auf die Theologie Martin Bucers* (Steiner, Wiesbaden, 1975).

Künzli, E., "Quellenproblem und mystischer Schriftsinn in Zwinglis Genesis und Exoduskommentar," *Zwingliana* 9 (1949–54), 185–207, 253–307.

Kurze, D., "Der niedere Klerus in der sozialen Welt des späten Mittelalters," in *Beiträge zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte des Mittelalters,* ed. K. Schultz (Bohlau, Cologne/Vienna, 1976), pp. 273–305.

Lambert, M., *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation* (Blackwell, Oxford, 2002).

Lane, A. N. S., "Calvin's Use of the Fathers and Medievals," *Calvin Theological Journal* 16 (1981), 149–205.

Lane, A. N. S., *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers* (T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1999).

Leff, G., *Bradwardine and the Pelagians: A Study of His "De Causa Dei" and its Opponents* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1957).

Leff, G., *William of Ockham: The Metamorphosis of Scholastic Discourse* (Manchester University Press, Manchester, UK, 1977).

Liere, K. E. van, "Humanism and Scholasticism in Sixteenth-Century Academe: Five Student Orations from the University of Salamanca," *Renaissance Quarterly* 53 (2000), 57–107.

Lindberg, C., *The European Reformations* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1996).

Locher, G. W., "Praedicatio verbi Dei est verbum Dei: Heinrich Bullinger zwischen Zwingli und Luther; Ein Beitrag zu seiner Theologie," *Zwingliana* 10 (1954), 47–57.

Locher, G. W., "Zwingli und Erasmus," *Zwingliana* 13 (1969), 37–61.

Locher, G. W., "Von Bern nach Genf: Die Ursachen der Spannung zwischen zwinglischer und calvinistischer Reformation," in W. Balke, C. Graafland, and H. Harkema (eds.), *Wegen et Gestalten in het Gereformeerd Protestantisme* (Ton Bolland, Amsterdam, 1976), pp. 75–87.

Logan, G. M., "Substance and Form in Renaissance Humanism," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 7 (1977), 1–34.

Luchsinger, F., *Der Baslerbuchdruck als Vermittler italienischer Geistes* (Helbing & Lichtenhahn, Basle, 1953).

Machilek, F., "Die Frömmigkeit und die Krise des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts," *Medievalia Bohemica* 3 (1970), 209–27.

Maeder, K., *Die via media in der schweizerischen Reformation: Studien zum Problem der Kontinuität im Zeitalter der Glaubenspaltung* (Zwingli Verlag, Zurich, 1970).

Martin, D. D., "The *Via Moderna*, Humanism and the Hermeneutics of Late Medieval Monastic Life," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 51 (1990), 179–97.

Maurer, W., "Melanchthons Loci Communes von 1521 als wissenschaftliche Programmschrift: Ein Beitrag zur Hermeneutik der Reformationszeit," *Luther-Jahrbuch* 27 (1960), 1–50.

McGrath, A. E., "'Augustinianism'" A Critical Assessment of the so-called 'Medieval Augustinian Tradition' on Justification," *Augustiniana* 31 (1981), 247–67.

McGrath, A. E., "Humanist Elements in the Early Reformed Doctrine of Justification," *ARG* 73 (1982), 5–20.

McGrath, A. E., "Forerunners of the Reformation? A Critical Examination of the Evidence for Precursors of the Reformation Doctrines of Justification," *HThR* 75 (1982), 219–42.

McGrath, A. E., "*Homo assumptus?* A Study in the Christology of the *Via Moderna*, with Particular Reference to William of Ockham," *EThL* 60 (1985), 283–97.

McGrath, A. E., *Luther's Theology of the Cross: Martin Luther's Theological Breakthrough* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1985).

McGrath, A. E., "John Calvin and Late Medieval Thought: A Study in Late Medieval Influences upon Calvin's Theological Development," *ARG* 77 (1986), 58–78.

McGrath, A. E., *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2nd edn, 1998).

Michon, C., *Nominalisme: la théorie de la signification d'Occam* (Vrin, Paris, 1994).

Moeller, B., "Die deutschen Humanisten und die Anfänge der Reformation," *ZKG* 70 (1959), 46–61.

Moeller, B., "Frömmigkeit in Deutschland um 1500," *ARG* 56 (1965), 5–31.

Moeller, B., "Probleme der Reformationsgeschichtsforschung," *ZKG* 76 (1965), 246–57.

Moeller, B., "Die Ursprunge der reformierten Kirche," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 100 (1975), 642–53.

Moeller, B., "Luther und die Städte," in *Aus der Lutherforschung: Drei Vorträge* (Westdeutscher Verlag, Opladen, 1983), pp. 9–26.

Moeller, B., "Erwägungen zur Bedeutung Erfurts als Kommunikationszentrum der frühen Reformation," in U. Weiss (ed.), *Erfurt: Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Bohlau, Weimar, 1995), pp. 275–82.

Monheit, M. L., "Guillaume Budé, Andrea Alciato, Pierre de l'Estoile: Renaissance Interpreters of Roman Law," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 68 (1997), 21–40.

Monnerjahn, E., *Giovanni Pico delta Mirandola: Ein Beitrag zur philosophischen Theologie des Humanismus* (Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1960).

Moore, R. I., *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Power and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1990).

Mühlen, K.-H. zur, "Die *auctoritas patrum* in Martin Luthers Schrift 'Von den Konziliis und Kirchen' (1539)," in Leif Grane, Alfred Schindler, and Markus Wriedt (eds.), *Auctoritas patrum II: Neue Beiträge zur Rezeption der Kirchenväter im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz, 1998), pp. 141–52.

Muir, E., "The Italian Renaissance in America," *American Historical Review* 100 (1995), 1095–1118.

Müller, A. V., *Luthers theologische Quellen: Seine Verteidigung gegen Denifle und Grisar* (Topelmann, Giessen, 1912).

Müller, J., *Martin Bucers Hermeneutik* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Gütersloh, 1965).

Näf, W., *Vadian und seine Stadt St Gallen* (2 vols, Verlag der Fehr'schen Buchhandlung, St Gallen, 1944–57).

Näf, W., "Schweizerische Humanismus: Zu Glareans 'Helvetiae Descriptio'," *Schweizerische Beiträge zur allgemeinen Geschichte* 5 (1947), 186–98.

Najemy, J. M., "Baron's Machiavelli and Renaissance Republicanism," *American Historical Review* 101 (1996), 119–29.

Nauert, C. G., "The Clash of Humanists and Scholastics: An Approach to Pre-Reformation Controversies," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 4 (1973), 1–18.

Nauert, C. G., *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1995).

Neuser, W. H., *Die reformatorische Wende bei Zwingli* (Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen, 1977).

Newald, R., *Probleme und Gestalte des deutschen Humanismus* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1963).

Nischan, B., *Lutherans and Calvinists in the Age of Confessionalism* (Ashgate, Aldershot, 1999).

Nipperdey, T., "Die Reformation als Problem der marxistischen Geschichtswissenschaft," in *Reformation, Revolution, Utopie: Studien zum 16. Jahrhundert* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1975), pp. 9–34.

Noe, A., *Der Einfluss des italienischen Humanismus auf die deutsche Literatur vor 1600: Ergebnisse jüngerer Forschung und ihre Perspektiven* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1993).

Oberman, H. A., *Archbishop Thomas Bradwardine, A Fourteenth Century Augustinian: A Study of His Theology in lts Historical Context* (Kemink & Zoon, Utrecht, 1957).

Oberman, H. A., "*Facientibus quod in se est Deus non denegat gratiam:* Robert Holcot O.P. and the Beginnings of Luther's Theology," *HThR* 55 (1962), 317–42.

Oberman, H. A., *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1963).

Oberman, H. A., "Headwaters of the Reformation: *Initia Lutheri – Initia Reformationis*," in H. A. Oberman (ed.), *Luther and the Dawn of the Modern Era* (Brill, Leiden, 1974), pp. 40–88.

Oberman, H. A., "Tuus sum, salvum me fac: Augustinreveil zwischen Renaissance und Reformation," in C. P. Mayer and W. Eckermann (eds.), *Scientia Augustiniana: Studien über Augustinus, den Augustinismus und den Augustinerorden* (Augustinus Verlag, Würzburg, 1975), pp. 349–94.

Oberman, H. A., "Reformation: Epoche oder Episode?," *ARG* 68 (1977), 56–111.

Oberman, H. A., *Werden und Wertung der Reformation: Vom Wegestreit zum Glaubenskampf* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1977).

Oberman, H. A., "Fourteenth Century Religious Thought: A Premature Profile," *Speculum* 53 (1978), 80–93.

Oberman, H. A., *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought Illustrated by Key Documents* (Holt Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1981).

Oberman, H. A., "*Initia Calvini*: The Matrix of Calvin's Reformation," in W. H. Neuser (ed.), *Calvinus Sacrae Scripturae Professor* (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, 1994), pp. 117–27.

Offenberg, A. K., "Untersuchungen zum hebräischen Buchdruck in Neapel um 1490," in L. Hellinga and H. Härtel (eds.), *Buch und Text im 15. Jahrhundert* (Hauswedell, Hamburg, 1978), pp. 129–41.

Paqué, R., *Das Pariser Nominalistenstatut: Zur Entstehung des Realitätsbegriffs der neuzeitlichen Naturwissenschaft (Occam, Buridan und Petrus Hispanicus, Nikolaus von Autrecourt und Gregor von Rimini)* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1970).

Payne, J. B., "Towards the Hermeneutics of Erasmus," in J. Coppens (ed.), *Scrinium Erasmianum II* (Brill, Leiden, 1970), pp. 13–49.

Pérez-Ilzarbe, P., *El significado de las proposiciones. Jerónimo Pardo († 1502) y las teorías medievales de la proposición* (Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona, 1999).

Peter, R., "Rhétorique et prédication selon Calvin," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 55 (1975), 249–72.

Pilvousek, J., "Jodocus Trutfetter (1460–1519) und der Erfurter Nominalismus," in D. von der Pforden (ed.), *Große Denker Erfurts und der Erfurter Universität* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 2002), pp. 96–117.

Pinborg, J., *Logik und Semantik im Mittelalter: Ein Überblick* (Frommann-Holzboog, Stuttgart, 1972).

Pini, G., "La dottrina della creazione e la ricezione delle opere di Tommaso d'Aquino nelle Quaestiones de esse et essentia (qq. 1–7) di Egidio Romano," *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 3 (1992), 271–304.

Poppi, A., "Il problema della filosofia morale nella scuola padovana del Rinascimento: Platonismo e Aristotelismo nella definizione del metodo dell'ethica," in *Platon et Aristote à la Renaissance* (XVIe Colloque Internationale de Tours, Vrin, Paris, 1976), pp. 105–46.

Post, R. R., *The Modern Devotion: Confrontation with Reformation and Humanism* (Brill, Leiden, 1968).

Prete, S., "Leistungen der Humanisten auf dem Gebiete der lateinischen Philologie," *Philologus* 109 (1965), 259–69.

Radetti, G., "Le origini dell'umanesimo civile fiorentino neI 1400," *Giornale critico della filosophia italiana*, 3rd series, 12 (1959), 98–112.

Raeder, S., *Das Hebräische bei Luther untersucht bis zum Ende der ersten Psalmenvorlesung* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1961).

Raeder, S., *Die Benutzung des masoretischen Textes bei Luther in der Zeit zwischen der ersten und zweiten Psalmenvorlesung* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1967).

Raeder, S., *Grammatica Theologica: Studien zu Luthers Operationes in Psalmos* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1977).

Randall, J. H., "The Development of Scientific Method in the School of Padua," in P. O. Kristeller and P. P. Wiener (eds.), *Renaissance Essays* (Harper & Row, New York, 1968), pp. 217–51.

Raubenheimer, R., "Martin Bucer und seine humanistischen Speyerer Freunde," *Blätter für pfilzische Kirchengeschichte und religiöse Volkskunde* 32 (1965), 1–52.

Ravenswaay, J. M. J. Lange van, *Augustinus totus noster: Das Augustinverständnis bei Johannes Calvin* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1990).

Renaudet, A., *Préréforme et humanisme à Paris pendant les premières guerres d'Italie (1494–1517)* (Librairie d'Argences, Paris, 2nd edn, 1953).

Reuter, K., *Das Grundverständnis der Theologie Calvins* (Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen, 1963).

Reuter, K., *Vom Scholaren bis zum jungen Reformator: Studien zum Werdegang Johannes Calvins* (Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen, 1981).

Rhijn, M. van, "Wessel Gansfort te Heidelberg en de strijd tussen de 'via antiqua' en de 'via moderna'," in *Studien over Wessel Gansfort en zijn tijd* (Kemink en Zoon, Utrecht, 1933), pp. 23–37.

Rice, E. F., "The Humanist Idea of Christian Antiquity: Lefèvre d'Etaples and his Circle," *Studies in the Renaissance* 9 (1962), 126–60.

Rich, A., *Die Anfänge der Theologie Huldrych Zwinglis* (Zwingli Verlag, Zurich, 1949).

Rijk, L. M. de, *Jean Buridan (c.1292–c.1360): eerbiedig ondermijner van het aristotelisch substantie-denken* (Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Amsterdam, 1994)

Ritter, A., *Studien zur Spätscholatik I: Marsilius von Inghen und die okkamistische Schule in Deutschland* (Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Heidelberg, 1921).

Ritter, A., *Studien zur Spätscholastik II. Via antiqua und via moderna auf den deutschen Universitäten des XV Jahrhunderts* (Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Heidelberg, 1922).

Ritter, A., Die geschichtliche Bedeutung des deutschen Humanismus," *Historische Zeitschrift* 127 (1922–3), 393–453.

Robey, D., "P. P. Vergerio the Elder: Republicanism and Civic Values in the Work of an Early Humanist," *Past and Present* 58 (1973), 3–37.

Rogge, J., *Zwingli und Erasmus: Die Friedensgedanken des jungen Zwinglis* (Calwer Verlag, Stuttgart, 1962).

Rüger, H. P., "Karlstadt als Hebräist an der Universität Wittenberg," *ARG* 75 (1984), 297–309.

Rummel, E., *Erasmus and his Catholic critics* (De Graaf, Nieuwkoop, 1989).

Rummel, E., *The Humanist-Scholastic Debate in the Renaissance and Reformation* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1995).

Saenger, P., "Silent Reading: Its Impact on Late Medieval Script," *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 13 (1982), 367–414.

Santos-Noya, M., *Die Sünden und Gnadenlehre des Gregor von Rimini* (Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, 1990).

Schabel, C., *Theology at Paris 1316–1345: Peter Auriol and the Problem of Divine Foreknowledge and Future Contingents* (Ashgate, Aldershot, 2000).

Schenker-Frei, V., *Biblioteca Vadiana: Die Bibliothek des Humanisten Joachim von Watt nach dem Katalog des Josua Kessler von 1553* (Vadian-Studien 9, Verlag der Fehr'schen Buchhandlung, St Gallen, 1973).

Schepers, H., "Holkot contra dicta Crathom," *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 77 (1970), 320–54, 79 (1972), 106–36.

Schilling, J., "Determinatio secunda almae facultatis theologiae Parisiensis super Apologiam Philippi Melanchthonis pro Luthero scriptam," in *Lutheriana: Zum 500. Geburtstag Martin Luther* (Archiv zur Weimarer Ausgabe 5, Bohlau, Cologne/Vienna, 1984), pp. 351–75.

Schindler, A., "Augustins Werk *De Civitate Dei* bei den Reformatoren, vor allem Luther und Zwingli," in J. van Oort (ed.), *De Kerkvaders in Reformatie en Nadere Reformatie* (Boekencentrum, Zoetermeer, 1997), pp. 35–44.

Schüssler, H., *Der Primät der Heiligen Schrift als theologisches und kanonistisches Problem im Spätmittelalter* (Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1977).

Schulze, M., "'Via Gregorii' in Forschung und Quellen," in H. A. Oberman (ed.), *Gregor von Rimini: Werk und Wirkung bis zur Reformation* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, 1981), pp. 1–126.

Seigel, J. E., "'Civic Humanism' or Ciceronian Rhetoric? The Culture of Petrarch and Bruni," *Past and Present* 34 (1966), 3–48.

Shank, M. H., *"Unless you Believe, you shall not Understand": Logic, University, and Society in Late Medieval Vienna* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1988).

Shuger, D. J., *Sacred Rhetoric: The Christian Grand Style in the English Renaissance* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1988).

Sider, R. J., *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt: The Development of His Thought 1517–1525* (Brill, Leiden, 1974).

Sieber, M., "Glarean in Basel, 1514–1517 und 1522–1529," *Jahrbuch des Historischen Vereins des Kantons Glarus* 60 (1963), 53–75.

Smalley, B., *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Blackwell, Oxford, 3rd edn, 1983).

Smith, K., "Ockham's Influence on Gregory of Rimini's Natural Philosophy," in V. Syros, A. Kouris, and H. Kalokairinou (eds.), *Dialexeis: Akademaiko etos 1996–7* (Nicosia, Homilos Philosophias Panepistemiou Kyprou, 1999), pp. 107–42.

Snoek, G. J. C., *Medieval Piety from Relics to the Eucharist* (Brill, Leiden, 1995).

Spitz, L. W., *The Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1963).

Spitz, L. W., "The Course of German Humanism," in H. A. Oberman with T. A. Brady (eds.), *Itinerarium Italicum: The Profile of the Italian Renaissance in the Mirror of its European Transformations* (Brill, Leiden, 1975), pp. 371–436.

Smits, L., *Saint Augustin dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin I: étude de critique littéraire* (Van Gorcum, Assen, 1956).

Sprenger, P., *Das Rätsel um die Bekehrung Calvins* (Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen, 1960).

Stackelberg, J. von, "Renaissance: 'Wiedergeburt' oder 'Wiederwunsch'? Zur Kritik an J. Triers Aufsatz über die Vorgeschichte des Renaissance-Begriffs," *BHR* 22 (1960), 406–20.

Stakemeier, E., *Der Kampf um Augustin: Augustinus und die Augustiner auf dem Tridentinum* (Bonifacius Druckerei, Paderborn, 1937).

Stange, C., "Über Luthers Beziehungen zur Theologie seines Ordens," *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 11 (1900), 574–85.

Stange, C., "Luther über Gregor von Rimini," *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 13 (1902), 721–7.

Stauffer, R., "Lefèvre d'Etaples, artisan ou spectateur de la Réforme?" *Bulletin de la société de l'histoire du protestantisme français* 113 (1967), 405–23.

Stauffer, R., "Einfluß und Kritik des Humanismus in Zwinglis 'Commentarius de vera et falsa religione,'" *Zwingliana* 16 (1983), 97–110.

Stayer, J. M., "Zwingli before Zürich: Humanist Reformer and Papal Partisan," *ARG* 72 (1981), 55–68.

Steinmetz, D. C., *Misericordia Dei: The Theology of Johannes von Staupitz in its Late Medieval Setting* (Brill, Leiden, 1968).

Steinmetz, D. C., *Luther and Staupitz: An Essay in the Intellectual Origins of the Protestant Reformation* (Duke University Press, Durham, NC, 1980).

Stephens, J. N., "Heresy in Medieval and Renaissance Florence," *Past and Present 54* (1972), 25–60.

Stephens, W. P., *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1986).

Stupperich, R., *Das Herforder Fraterhaus und die Devotia Moderna: Studien zur Frömmigkeitsgeschichte Westfalens an der Wende zur Neuzeit* (Aschendorff, Münster, 1975).

Stupperich, R., "Das Enchiridion Militis Christiani des Erasmus von Rotterdam nach seiner Entstehung, seinem Sinn und Charakter," *ARG* 69 (1978), 5–23.

Szczucki, L., "Between Scholasticism and Humanism: Philosophy at the University of Cracow in the Sixteenth Century," *Giornale critico della filosofia italiana* 7 (1987), 220–34.

Tavard, G. H., *Holy Writ or Holy Church: The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation* (Burns & Oates, London, 1959).

Tewes, G.-R., *Die Bursen der Kölner Artisten-Fakultät bis zur Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Bohlau, Cologne, 1993).

Tierney, B., "Ockham, the Conciliar Theory, and the Canonists," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 15 (1954), 40–70.

Tierney, B., "Pope and Council: Some New Decretist Texts," *Medieval Studies* 19 (1957), 197–218.

Tierney, B., "'Tria quippe distinguit iudicia . . .' A Note on Innocent III's Decretal *Per venerabilem*," *Speculum* 37 (1962), 48–59.

Toffanin, G., *Storia letteraria d'Italia: Il Cinquecento* (Vallardi, Milan, 6th edn, 1960).

Toffanin, G., *Storia dell'umanesimo II: l'umanesimo italiano* (Zanichelli, Bologna, 1964).

Torrance, T. F., "La philosophie et la théologie de Jean Mair ou Major (1469–1550)," *Archives de philosophie* 32 (1969), 531–47; 33 (1970), 261–94.

Torrance, T. F., "Intuitive and Abstractive Knowledge from Duns Scotus to John Calvin," in *De doctrina Ioannis Duns Scoti: Acta tertii Congressus Scotistici Internationalis* (Cura Commissionis Scotisticae, Rome, 1972), pp. 291–305.

Trapp, D., "Augustinian Theology of the Fourteenth Century: Notes on Editions, Marginalia, Opinions and Book-lore," *Augustiniana* 6 (1956), 146–274.

Treml, C., *Humanistische Gemeinschaftsbildung: sozio-kulturelle Untersuchung zur Entstehung eines neuen Gelehrtenstandes in der frühen Neuzeit* (Olms, Hildesheim, 1989).

Trier, J., "Zur Vorgeschichte des Renaissance-Begriff, *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 33 (1955), 45–63.

Trier, J., "Wiederwuchs," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 43 (1961), 177–87.

Trinkaus, C., *In Our Image and Likeness: Humanity and Divinity in Italian Humanist Thought* (2 vols, Constable, London, 1970).

Trinkaus, C., "A Humanist's Image of Humanism: The Inaugural Orations of Bartolommeo della Fonte," *Studies in the Renaissance* 7 (1960), 90–147.

Trödinger, K., *Stadt und Kirche im spätmittelalterlichen Würzburg* (Klett-Cotta, Stuttgart, 1978).

Trümpy, H., "Glarner Studenten im Zeitalter des Humanismus," in *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Landes Glarus: Festgabe des Historischen Vereins des Kantons Glarus* (Historischer Verein des Kantons Glarus, Glarus, 1952), pp. 273–84.

Ullmann, K. H., *Reformatoren vor der Reformation vornehmlich in Deutschland und den Niederlanden* (2 vols, Perthes, Hamburg, 1841–2).

Urban, W., "Die 'via moderna' an der Universität Erfurt am Vorabend der Reformation," in H. A. Oberman (ed.), *Gregor von Rimini: Werk und Wirkung bis zur Reformation* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, 1981), pp. 311–30.

Vasoli, C., "Loci Communes and the Rhetorical and Dialectical Traditions," in J. C. McLelland (ed.), *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform* (Wilfred Laurier University Press, Waterloo, ON, 1980), pp. 17–28.

Vignaux, P., *Justification et prédestination au XIVe siècle: Duns Scot, Pierre d'Auriole, Guillaume d'Occam, Gregoire de Rimini* (Vrin, Paris, 1934).

Villoslada, R. G., *La Universidad de Paris durante los estudios de Francisco de Vitoria O.P. (1507–1522)* (Universitas Gregoriana, Rome, 1938).

de Vooght, P., *Les sources de la doctrine chrétienne d'après les théologiens du XIVe siècle et du début du XVe* (Desclée de Brouwer, Bruges, 1954).

Walter, P., *Theologie aus dem Geist der Rhetorik: Sur Schriftauslegung des Erasmus von Rotterdam* (Matthias Grünewald Verlag, Mainz, 1991).

Weinstein, D., "In Whose Image and Likeness? Interpretations of Renaissance Humanism," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 33 (1972), 165–76.

Wendel, F., *Calvin: The Origins and Development of his Religious Thought* (Collins, London, 1974).

Wendel, F., *Calvin et l'humanisme* (Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1976).

Wendland, V., "Die Wissenschaftlehre Gregors von Rimini in der Diskussion," in H. A. Oberman (ed.), *Gregor von Rimini: Werk und Wirkung bis zur Reformation* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, 1981), pp. 241–300.

Werbeck, W., *Jacobus Pérez von Valencia: Untersuchungen zu seinem Psalmenkommentar* (Mohr, Tübingen, 1959).

Werner, K., *Die Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters III: Der Augustinismus in der Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters* (Bohlau, Vienna, 1883).

White, G., *Luther as Nominalist: A Study of the Logical Methods used in Martin Luther's Disputations in the Light of their Medieval Background* (Luther Agricola Society, Helsinki, 1994).

Willi, T., "Der Beitrag des Hebräischen zum Werden der Reformation in Basel," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 35 (1979), 139–54.

Witt, R., "The 'Crisis' after Forty Years," *American Historical Review* 101 (1996), 110–18.

Wolf, E., *Staupitz und Luther: Ein Beitrag zur Theologie des Johannes von Staupitz und deren Bedeutung für Luthers theologischen Werdegang* (Heinsius Verlag, Leipzig, 1927).

Wriedt, M., *Gnade und Erwählung: Eine Untersuchung zu Johann von Staupitz und Martin Luther* (von Zabern, Mainz, 1991).

Wright, D. F., "Accommodation and Barbarity in John Calvin's Old Testament Commentaries," in A. G. Auld (ed.), *Understanding Poets and Prophets* (JSOT Press, Sheffield, UK, 1993), pp. 413–27.

Wyss, K.-H., *Leo Jud: Seine Entwicklung zum Reformator 1519–1523* (Peter Lang, Berne/Frankfurt, 1976).

Zanta, L., *La renaissance du stoïcisme au XVIe siècle* (Slatkine, Geneva, 1975).

Ziegler, E., "Zur Reformation als Reformation des Lebens und der Sitten." *Rorschacher Neujahrsblatt* (1984), 53–71.

Zika, C., *Reuchlin und die okkulte Tradition der Renaissance* (Thorbecke, Sigmaringen, 1998).

Zürcher, C., *Konrad Pellikans Wirken in Zürich 1526–1556* (Theologischer Verlag, Zurich, 1975).

Zumkeller, A., *Dionysius de Montina: Ein neuentdeckter Augustinertheologe des Spätmittelalters* (Augustinus Verlag, Wurzburg, 1948).

Zumkeller, A., "Hugolin von Orvieto über Urstand und Erbsünde," *Augustiniana* 3 (1953), 35–62, 165–93, 4 (1954), 25–46.

Zumkeller, A., "Hugolin von Orvieto über Prädestination, Rechtfertigung und Verdienst," *Augustiniana* 4 (1954), 109–56; 5 (1955), 5–51.

Zumkeller, A., "Die Augustinertheologen Simon Fidati von Cascia und Hugolin von Orvieto und Martin Luthers Kritik an Aristoteles," *ARG* 54 (1963), 13–37.

Zumkeller, A., "Die Augustinerschule des Mittelalters: Vertreter und philosophisch-theologische Lehre (Übersicht nach dem heutigen Stand der Forschung)," *Analecta Augustiniana* 27 (1964), 167–262.

Zumkeller, A., "Der Wiener Theologieprofessor Johannes von Retz und seine Lehre von Urstand, Erbsünde, Gnade und Verdienst," *Augustiniana* 22 (1972), 118–84; 540–82.

Zumkeller, A., "Johannes Klenkok O.S.A. im Kampf gegen den 'Pelagianismus' seiner Zeit: Seine Lehre über Gnade, Rechtfertigung und Verdienst," *Recherches Augustiniennes* 13 (1978), 231–333.

Zumkeller, A., "Die Lehre des Erfurter Augustinertheologen Johannes von Dorsten über Gnade, Rechtfertigung und Verdienst," *Theologie und Philosophie* 53 (1978), 27–64; 127–219.

Zumkeller, A., "Der Augustinertheologe Johannes Hiltalingen von Basel über Erbsünde, Gnade und Verdienst," *Analecta Augustiniana* 43 (1980), 57–162.

Zumkeller, A., "Erbsünde, Gnade und Rechtfertigung im Verständnis der Erfurter Augustinertheologen des Spätmittelalters," *ZKG* 92 (1981), 39–59.

Zumkeller, A., "Der Augustiner Angelus Dobelinus, erster Theologieprofessor der Erfurter Universität, über Gnade, Rechtfertigung und Verdienst," *Analecta Augustiniana* 44 (1981), 69–147.

Zumkeller, A., *Johannes von Staupitz und seine christliche Heilslehre* (Augustinus Verlag, Würzburg, 1994).

Zumkeller, A., "Der Wiener Universitätsprofessor Andreas Sachs OESA und sein Kommentar zum vierten Sentenzenbuch in MS. 1550 des Universitätsbibliothek von Padua," in W. Krümmel et al. (eds.), *Traditio augustiniana: Studien über Augustinus und seine Rezeption* (Augustinus Verlag, Würzburg, 1994), pp. 557–82.

Index

Note: Where the notes to more than one chapter begin on the same page, they are distinguished by the addition of a letter, e.g. 190 n.1a.

Abelard, Peter 19
  and nominalism 68–9
acceptatio divina 27, 78, 81, 86, 87
accommodation, in Calvin 54–5
Ailly, Pierre d'
  and nominalism 71–2, 73
  and papacy and councils 16
  and soteriology 73, 107
  and *via moderna* 88, 94, 107
Albert of Padua 24
Albertus Magnus 67, 68–9
Alexander III, Pope, *Cum Christo* 141–2
Alexander of San Elpido 84
allegory 148–9, 150–1, 156–7, 159, 162, 173
  and Origen 148, 153, 155, 179
Ambrosius of Speier 140
Amerbach, Johannes, edition of Augustine 172, 174–5, 178, 249–50 n.22, 250 n.23
Anabaptists, and radicalism 129, 130
Andrew of St Victor 122
Anselm of Canterbury 168
Anselm of Laon, and *Glossa Ordinaria* 123–4
Anshelm, Valerius 48
anticlericalism, late medieval 11, 13–14
Apocrypha 231–2 n.2
Aquinas, St Thomas 19, 67
  and Augustine 60
  and hermeneutics 24, 120–1, 122–3, 128, 164
  and morality and merit 80
  and realism 69, 72
  and revelation 120
  and theology and Scripture 120
  and *via antiqua* 104
aristocracy, and episcopate 14
Aristotle
  and humanism 36, 41
  and Luther 145, 176–7
  and scholasticism 61
Arnobius Junior 174
Arnoldi, Bartholomeus 104, 109
Augsburg Confession, as authoritative 6
Augsburg, Peace of (1555) 7
Augustine of Denmark 140
Augustine of Hippo, St
  Amerbach edition 172, 174–5, 178, 249–50 n.22, 250 n.23
  anti-Pelagian writings 86–7, 99, 113, 169–72, 174, 175–6, 177–80
  authority and interpretation 18, 23–4, 44, 60–1, 167, 168–9, 173–4
  and Calvin 97, 99, 101–2, 175–6
  de civitate Dei 174

Augustine of Hippo, St (*contd*)
de spiritu de litera 61, 113, 177–8
and grace 23–4, 113–14, 169–72, 175, 177–9
and hermeneutics 149, 152, 160, 164–5
humanist reception 37, 44, 125, 172, 173–4
and justification 84, 85–7, 99, 172, 177, 248 n.5
and Luther 59, 61, 113, 160, 176–8
and pseudonymous works 23–4, 60, 170, 177
scholastic reception 168–72
and *Sentences* 23, 60, 168, 169–70
and soteriology 23, 170–1, 177
and *vera theologia* 63, 174–5, 180
Augustinian Order
and historico-critical method 23, 84, 167, 170–1
and logico-critical method 84, 167
and Luther 103, 107
and Mariology 24
and nominalism 71–2, 85
and *sola scriptura* principle 144–5
and theological schools 19–20, 101–2
and Vermigli 101–2
see also Erfurt; *schola Augustiniana moderna*
Augustunis Triumphus of Ancona 24
Aureole, Peter 76, 83
Averroist controversy 75
Avignon, and papacy 15–16

Bagnacavallo, Filipo 89
Barbaro, Ermolao 36
Baron, Hans 35–6
Basil of Caesarea, and Scripture and tradition 139
Basle, Council (1431–49) 24–5
Basle University
and humanism 48
and *via moderna* and *via antiqua* 223 n.94
and Zwingli 88–9
Bauer, Karl 108, 162
Baysio, Guido do 142, 239 n.103
Berengar of Tours, and *Glossa Ordinaria* 123
Berne, as Reformed center 188
Bernstein, Eckhard 34, 40
Beza, Theodore de, and Calvin's theological development 90–1, 96, 224–5 n.113
Bible
allegorical sense *see* allegory
anagogical sense 149, 159, 161
authority 61, 121, 134, 140, 147, 150, 179
canon 231–2 n.2
Christological interpretation 53, 152–3, 155, 159–60, 162–3
"fourfold sense" 149–50
humanist concern with text 41–4, 49, 53, 54, 64, 66, 119, 125–30, 187
interpretation *see* hermeneutics
"letter" and "spirit" 150–3, 154–5, 159–61
literal sense 141, 148–50, 151–6, 159–61, 163–5
and literary styles 148–9
and Luther 59, 63–4, 177–8
rediscovery 119
text 119, 125–6
theological priority 120–1, 129, 137–8, 150
and tradition 137–44, 145–6
translation 122–4, 127–8, 186–7; *see also* Vulgate
tropological sense 53, 149–51, 154–5, 156, 159, 161–5
unity of Old and New Testaments 53, 79–80, 161
vernacular 122–4, 129–30
as Word of God 134–5, 148
see also Greek; Hebrew; New Testament; Old Testament; return *ad fontes*; *sola scriptura* principle; Vulgate

Biel, Gabriel
and Augustine 23–4
Collectorium circa quattuor sententiarum libros 104
and Gregory of Rimini 106
and justification 23–4, 78–9, 104, 111
Lectura super canonem missae 105
and Luther 105, 111–12, 226 n.140
and nominalism 72, 73–4
and Scripture and tradition 142
and soteriology 72, 107
and two powers of God 81
bishops, aristocratic 14
Bizer 108
Bollinger, Daniel 89
Bonaventure, St 19–20, 144
Borchert, Ernst 199 n.65
Bradwardine, Thomas
and Pelagianism 86–7, 170–1
and *sola scriptura* principle 146, 240 n.120
Brethren of the Common Life 12
Breviscoxa, Johannes 16, 142, 143–4
Bruni, Leonardo 35
Bubenheimer, Ulrich 164
Bucer, Martin
commentary on Psalms 151
and Erasmus 52–3, 57–8, 156–7
and hermeneutics 53, 156–7, 161
and justification 53, 187
and moralism 53, 57
"productive misunderstanding" of Luther 52–3, 62
Budé, Guillaume
Annotationes in quattuor et vigintii Pandectarum libros 133
Institutions du Prince 54, 212 n.126
Bugenhagen, Johann 221 n.53
Bullinger, Johann Heinrich 49, 181
Burckhardt, Jacob 35, 36
Buridan, Jean 74, 105

Calvin, John
and accommodation 54–5
and Augustine 175–6
and "Calvinism" 7
and conversion 54, 55, 175–6
and Duns Scotus 100–1
early theological development 2, 90–103
and ecclesiology 98
and hermeneutics 152
and humanism 53–8
Institutio 6, 51, 53–4, 56–7, 95, 97–8, 100
and justification 57–8
and natural knowledge of God 56–7
and Ockham 95, 101
and rhetoric 54–5, 57, 58
and scholasticism 54, 90–1, 94–101
and *via moderna* 2, 90–8
and voluntarism 99–101
and Zwingli 188
Calvinism, use of term 7 *see also* Reformed theology
canonists, and Scripture and tradition 123, 139, 142–3
Capreolus, Johannes 60–1, 170
Carthage, Council (418) 26, 27
Cassian, John 23
catechisms, Lutheran
as authoritative 6
and Calvin 98
causality
covenantal 78–80, 110–12
ontological 76–9, 110
Celtis, Konrad 46
Chatton, Walter 70
church, late medieval
and crisis of authority 15–17, 24–5, 28–9, 32–3, 45, 185–6
and ecclesiology 2, 98, 188–9
and *regula fidei* 146
and Scripture 138–9, 144–5, 147
seen as Pelagian 25, 27, 171–2, 186
and theology 4, 58–9, 185–6
Cicero, Marcus Tullius
De natura deorum 56–8
and humanism 35–7, 40–1, 50
Orationes 37, 124
Topica 41

Clement of Alexandria 148
clergy
  and celibacy 45, 48
  education of 12–13
  and lay education 12–13
  status 13–14
Colet, John 134
Colladon, Nicolas 91, 224 n.113
Collège de Montaigu 193 n.13
Collimitius, Georg 208 n.67
Colloquy of Marburg (1529) 6, 188
Cologne University, and *via antiqua* 19, 104
Complutensian Polyglot 128, 135, 136
Conciliar Movement and crisis of authority 16–17, 24–5
confession, and Luther 30
confessionalism, rise 7
Constance, Council (1414–17) 17, 86
Constance School of Reception Aesthetics 190 n.1a
Contarini, Gasparo 26
contrition, and Luther 30
Cop, Nicolas 90
Cordier, Mathurin 91, 93
Coronel, Antonio 93, 96
covenant
  double 80
  and justification 78–80, 110–12
Cowton, Robert 84
Crathorn, William 70–1, 72
Cuspinian, Johannes 208 n.67

de vera et falsa poenitentia (ps.-Augustine) 60, 170, 178
della Fonte, Bartolommeo 36–7, 124
devotio moderna 12, 14–15, 156
dialectics
  and Calvin 96
  and Luther 161
  and *via moderna* 20–2, 74–8, 87, 94
Dionysius of Montina 85
doctrine
  diversity *see* pluralism, doctrinal
  Lutheran innovation 30
  and medieval heresy 32–3
  and opinion 16, 18, 25–8, 185–6
  and Scripture 120–1, 131, 133–7, 140–4, 151, 157
  and Zurich Reformation 46
Dominican Order
  and Mariology 24
  and merit 80
  and schools of theology 19, 104
Donation of Constantine 23, 48, 128
Dorp, Martin 136
Doumergue, Emile 92
Dungersheim, Jerome 228 nn.165–6
Duns Scotus 19–20, 24
  and Augustine 60
  and Calvin 100–1
  Opus Oxoniense 88
  Ordinatio 89
  and Scripture and theology 138
  and two powers of God 21, 75, 78
  and voluntarism 80–1, 99–101
  and Zwingli 67, 88–90
Dürer, Albrecht 63

Ebeling, G. 161, 163
ecclesiology
  and Augustine 171–2
  and Calvin 98
  and Great Schism 22
  and Luther 2
Eck, Johann 62, 170, 174, 179
education
  clerical 12–13
  and humanism 37, 50, 52, 61, 65
  and lay piety 12
  Lutheran 130
  Reformed 6, 153
eloquence *see* rhetoric
Enlightenment, and humanism 35, 38
epistemology
  and Calvin 95–6, 99
  and morality 73
  nominalist 69–72, 73, 85, 87–8, 96, 99, 102, 107
  realist 84
Epistola ad Demetriadem (ps.-Augustine) 170

Erasmus, Desiderius
and accommodation 54–5
Adnotationes in Novum Testamentum 128
Annotationes 132
and Augustine 173–4, 176
and Bucer 52–3, 57–8, 156
and Calvin 54–5
and cosmopolitanism 46, 49
and *devotio moderna* 12
Enchiridion Militis Christiani 14, 40–1, 50–1, 150, 153, 155
and free will 26–7, 51, 63
and hermeneutics 150–1, 153–4, 155–7, 161, 173
and humanism 34, 38, 39, 41, 61, 64, 184
Hyperaspistes 26–7
Institutio principis Christiani 54
and Jerome 44, 173–4
and justification 26–7, 57–8
and Luther 26–7, 59, 62–3, 108, 161
and New Testament 43–4, 128, 130, 131–2, 135–6, 173
Novum Instrumentum omne 49, 128, 134, 154, 187
and Old Testament 151
and Origen 153, 154–5, 173, 242 nn.11, 12, 243 n.17
philosophia Christi 49–50, 134
and scholasticism 14–15
and *via moderna* 94
and Vulgate 135–6, 187
and Zwingli 48–52, 89–90, 153–6, 185, 187
Erfurt (Augustinian house)
and Luther 103–5, 109
and *schola Augustiniana moderna* 109
and *via moderna* 20, 104
Erfurt University
and humanism 41
quodlibetal disputation 104
and *via moderna* 19, 103–5, 112
eucharist
and communion in both kinds 48
and doctrinal diversity 16
evangelicalism
of Calvin 55, 57
of Reformers 6, 90
Execrabilis (papal bull) 17
exegesis
humanist 132–6
and Luther 146, 149
and Zwingli 154–6
see also hermeneutics
Eyb, Albrecht von 39, 205 n.31

faith, and justification 65, 111, 178, 187–8
fathers of the church
and humanism 42–4, 125
and Reformers 44, 59, 61, 63, 146
and *testimonium patrum* 154, 166, 167–81
see also Augustine of Hippo, St
Feldkirchen, Bartholomäus 59–60
"First Zurich Disputation" (1523) 44–5, 146, 157–8
Flacius Illyricus (Matthias Flacius)
Catalogus testium veritatis 30
and hermeneutics 248 n.100
Magdeburg Centuries 30–1
Florus of Lyons 249 n.10
Forerunners of the Reformation 1, 8, 29–33, 96
and confessional bias 31
and Huss 137, 147, 191 n.10
and Luther 29–31
and medieval heresies 30, 31–3
and Wycliffe 37, 147
France
and late medieval anticlericalism 13–14
and opposition to Lutheranism 90
see also Paris University
Francis I of France 50, 90
Franciscan Order
and the church 144
and Mariology 24
and merit 80, 99
and papacy 141, 142
and schools of theology 19–20, 22

Franco-Italian war 16, 47
Frederick III, Elector Palatine 7
free will
  and Augustine 23–4
  and Erasmus 26–7, 51, 63, 153
  and Luther 26–7, 30, 63, 177
  and Zwingli 51, 153
Froben, Johannes 47, 49, 174
Fullonius, Jakob (Walker) 48

Ganoczy, Alexandre 55, 95–8
Gansfort, Wessel 29, 146
Geneva, as Reformed center 181, 188
Gerald of Bologna 139
Germany
  and humanism 39, 205 n.31
  late medieval theology 4
  and Lutheranism 6
  and nationalism 16
  political and religious tensions 6–7, 53
  see also Cologne University; Erfurt University; Heidelberg University; Tübingen University; Wittenberg University
Gerson, Jean 16, 164, 219 n.34
Gilbert of Poitiers 19
Gilbert the Universal, and *Glossa Ordinaria* 123–4
Giles of Rome 19, 24, 67
  and Luther 103
  and *schola Augustiniana moderna* 84–5, 86, 109
  and *sola scriptura* principle 144
Giustiniani, Paolo 26
Glarean, H. 39, 46, 48
  and Zwingli 88–9
Glossa Ordinaria 123–4, 133
God
  ordained and absolute powers 20–1, 74–8, 85, 87, 94
  self-limitation 21, 78
  see also righteousness of God
Gordon, Alexander 100
Goulet, Robert, *Heptadogma* 36
grace
  in Aquinas 128
  in Augustine 23–4, 113–14, 169–72, 175, 177–9
  and Augustinians 72, 85, 86, 111
  and Calvin 226 n.133
  "created habits" 21–2, 27, 76–7, 85, 87, 99, 110, 112, 177
  and faith 111, 178, 187–8
  and Luther 30, 72, 79, 110–11, 177–8
  and nominalism 71–2
  and *schola Augustiniana moderna* 99
  and *via moderna* 78
  and Virgin Mary 131
  in Zwingli 175
  see also merit
Gratian of Bologna 95, 98, 139–40
Great Schism 16–17, 22, 186
Greek
  study 49, 61–2, 125–6, 128–30, 154, 180
  and Vulgate 49, 121–2, 124, 131, 135
Gregory XI, Pope 16
Gregory of Rimini
  and Augustine 87, 170–1
  and Biel 106
  and Calvin 98, 100–1, 102
  Commentary on the Sentences 101–2, 170
  and epistemology 88, 99
  and historico-critical method 167
  influence 67, 71–2
  and Luther 103–6
  and Mariology 24
  and nominalism 68, 70–1, 85, 88, 96, 99, 101, 106–7
  and *schola Augustiniana moderna* 19, 83, 85, 86–7, 99, 103–4, 109, 167
  and *sola scriptura* principle 145
  and soteriology 71, 73, 107
  and Vermigli 101–2
  and *via moderna* 19, 74, 87, 98
  and voluntarism 74, 100–1
Grundmann, Herbert 32–3

Hadrian VI, Pope 16–17
Haec sancta (conciliar decree) 17
Hebrew
  and impact of print technology 127
  and Luther 59, 127–8, 187
  study 61, 126, 127–30, 151, 154, 180
  and Vulgate 121–2, 124, 187
Heidelberg Catechism, as authoritative 6, 7
Heidelberg Disputation (1518) 52, 62
Heidelberg University, and *via moderna* 74, 106
Henry of Friemar 24
Henry of Ghent 75
Henry of Langenstein 46, 71
heresies, medieval
  and Forerunners of Reformation 30, 31–3
  and papal authority 32
Hermelink, Heinrich 19, 104
hermeneutics 17, 44, 50, 148–66
  of Aquinas 24, 120–1, 122–3, 128, 164
  of Augustine 149, 152, 160, 164–5
  of Bucer 156–7, 161
  of Calvin 152
  and *Glossa Ordinaria* 123–4
  humanist 66, 119–20, 150–3, 184
  of Karlstadt 63–4, 164–5, 184
  of Luther 63–4, 65, 108, 113, 146, 149–50, 156, 159–66, 184, 187
  in Lutheran Reformation 157, 159–66
  and patristic testimony 154, 168
  and philology 129, 150–1, 153, 180, 186
  political 157–8
  and *Quadriga* 148–50, 157, 161, 163–5
  in Reformed theology 147, 153–9, 185
  and scholasticism 64–5, 148–50, 163–5, 184, 187
  and translation 124
  of *via moderna* 79–80
  of Zwingli 49, 153–9, 187
Hiltalingen, Johannes 24, 144, 240 n.116
Hincmar of Reims 249 n.10
history
  Marxist 2–3, 5
  see also method, historico-critical
Holcot, Robert 19, 70, 71–2, 78
Holy Spirit
  in Bucer 156–7
  in Luther 110, 130, 177
  in *schola Augustiniana moderna* 110
Hortus Animae 15
Hugh of St Victor 19
Hugolino of Orvieto 71, 85, 104, 109, 145
humanism 34–66
  academic status viii, 34–5, 183
  and Bucer 52–3, 57, 156–7
  and Calvin 53–8
  characteristics 40–4
  and *Christianismus renascens* 47, 49–50, 52, 58, 129
  and cosmopolitanism 39, 43, 46, 63, 97
  definitions 34–9, 64
  and exegesis 132–6
  and hermeneutics 66, 119–20, 150–3, 184
  influence on Reformation 7–8, 183–4
  Italian 35–9, 124, 125–7
  and jurists 133
  as a "lay order" 34, 41
  and literary scholarship 41–4, 47–8, 54, 58–9, 61, 66, 108, 119, 124–5, 150, 173, 187
  and Luther 58–9, 61–5, 108, 113
  "productive misunderstanding" of Lutheran Reformation 43, 52–3, 62–3
  northern European 37, 39, 40–4
  and origins of Lutheran church 58–66
  and origins of Reformed theology 44–58, 153, 185, 188

humanism (*cont'd*)
and *philosophia Christi* 49–50, 63, 134
and reception of Augustine 37, 44, 172, 173–4
and religion 38, 40–1
and scholasticism 34–5, 40, 43, 46, 63, 78, 180
and Zwingli 39, 46, 48–52, 89–90, 114, 154–6, 175
see also return *ad fontes*
Hunnius, Aegidius 152
Huss, Jan
as forerunner of Reformation 137, 147, 191 n.10
and Scripture and tradition 146, 147
Hypomnesticon (ps.-Augustine) 23–4, 170

Ibn Ezra, Abraham 151
ideas
and impact of print technology 17, 39, 47, 126–7, 134, 169
late medieval origins 3–4, 5–6
and social and economic issues vii–viii, 2–3, 5, 182–3, 189
identity
humanist 34–5, 40, 114
national 46–7
imitatio Christi
and Erasmus 57–8, 65, 157
and Zwingli 49
incarnation
in Erasmus 55, 94
in Ockham 22, 94
and two powers of God 22, 76, 94
indulgences 62, 144
Innocent III, Pope 123, 195 n.30
innovation, doctrinal 30, 144
Irenaeus of Lyons 138
Italian Renaissance
and classical scholarship 41
and origins of humanism 35–9, 184
and philology 124, 133–4, 187
and printing 126–7, 134
iustitia Dei see righteousness of God
Ivo of Chartres 139

Jerome, St 23, 170, 175, 242 n.12
and Erasmus 44, 173–4
and humanism 37, 44, 125
John XXII, Pope 15, 141–2
John of Reading 70
John of St Giles 19
Jolivet, Jean 69
Jud, Leo 210 n.93
Judaism, and interpretation of Old Testament 151–2, 155, 160
Junghans, Helmar 246 n.77
jurists, humanist 133
justice, and divine will 80–1
justification
and Augustine 84, 85–7, 99, 172, 177, 248 n.5
and Biel 23–4, 78–9, 104, 111
and Calvin 57–8
and covenant 78–80
and doctrinal diversity 18, 21–2, 25–8
ethical conception 53, 57–8, 114
and humanism 65
and Luther 25–6, 27–8, 49, 53, 65, 110–12, 114, 162–3, 177, 187
and nominalism 71
and ontology 76–9, 85, 110
and Pelagianism 25–8, 71, 86, 99, 113, 169–72, 178–9
and personalism 78
sola fide 65, 178, 187–8
and *via moderna* 25–8, 76–7, 110–11, 162
see also acceptatio divina; grace; merit

Kähler, Ernst 172
Kampf, Nicholas 46
Karlstadt (Andreas Bodenstein)
and Augustine 60, 172, 176, 178, 180
early theological development 2
excommunication 62
and hermeneutics 63–4, 164–5, 184

and knowledge of Hebrew 128
and soteriology 113–14, 165
and Wittenberg disputation 60–1, 62, 97, 178
Kimhi, David 151
knowledge, and nominalism 70–1, 99
knowledge of God, natural 56–7
Köhler, W. 175
Kristeller, Paul Oskar 35, 36, 37–8, 64, 68, 184
Kropatschev, F. 147
Künzli, Edwin 155

laity
and clergy 13–14
and education 12–13
and humanism 34, 41
and Mariology 12, 18, 24
and medieval piety 11–15, 18, 24, 189
Lambert of Utrecht, and *Glossa Ordinaria* 123
Lang, Johannes 61
Langenstein, Heinrich von 46, 71
Langton, Stephen 124
language, and humanism 41, 54–5, 61–2, 119, 150, 154, 180
Latin
and humanism 34, 39, 41, 126, 180
and scholasticism 14–15, 43, 122, 173
law
and gospel 147, 159, 160–1
and grace 178
and *mos italicus and mos gallicus* 133
and Scripture 147
testamentary 164
and theology 139–40
Le Roy Ladourie, Emmanuel 13
Lee, Edward 136
Lefèvre d'Etaples, Jacques
and hermeneutics 152–3, 155, 159, 160, 163, 165
Quincuplex Psalterium 132, 152
and reforming humanism 55, 134
and Vulgate text 132, 187
Leipzig Disputation (1519) 62–3
Lombard, Peter
and Calvin 95, 98
and Christological nihilism 141–2
and Luther 110
Sententiarum Libri Quattuor 23, 61, 98, 110, 168
and University of Paris 19
Lupulus, Heinrich (Wölfli) 48
Luther, Martin
An die Ratsherren 129–30
and Augustine 59, 61, 113, 160, 176–8
and Augustinian thought 82–3, 103–4, 106–12
and Bucer 52–3, 62
and covenantal theology 80, 110–12
Dictata super Psalterium 111, 112, 113, 145–6, 153, 159–60, 163
Disputatio contra scholasticam theologiam 97, 115, 226 n.140
and divine self-limitation 78
early theological development 2, 103–13, 176–7, 179
and Erasmus 26–7, 59, 62–3, 108, 161
excommunication 62
and free will 26–7, 30, 63, 177
and Hebrew 59, 127–8, 187
and Heidelberg disputation 52
and humanism 43, 53, 58–9, 61–5, 108, 113
and law and gospel 159, 160–1
and medieval heresy 30, 32–3
and New Testament text 132
and Ninety-Five Theses 62
as nominalist 72, 229 n.190
and origins of Reformation 29–30, 58–66
and philology 58–9, 134
and scholasticism 67, 103–4, 149–50, 187
Smaller Catechism 130
and *sola scriptura* principle 44, 130, 145–6, 177–8
Table-Talk 72, 108

Luther, Martin (*cont'd*)
and *theologia crucis* 160, 177, 247 n.85
and vernacular Bible 129–30
and *via moderna* 2, 25–6, 27–8, 64, 97–8, 103–5, 107, 110–13, 162, 186
"Von den Konziliis und Kirchen" 177
and Wittenberg 43, 59–62, 105–7, 112
and Wycliffe 86
and Zwingli 48–9
see also hermeneutics; justification; righteousness of God
Lutheran Reformation
and Erasmus 63
intellectual origins vii: as academic movement 59–62, 103, 114–15, 178–80, 183–5; and hermeneutics 149, 157, 159–66; and humanism 58–66; and late medieval theology 6, 60–1, 67, 103–15, 147; and patristic testimony 167–8, 176–81; and scholasticism 6, 60–1, 67, 103–15, 184
and Pelagianism of medieval church 25, 171–2, 186
and Reformed church 6–7, 188

Magdeburg Centuries 30–1
magisterium, teaching authority 26–7, 186
Major, John 94–9, 100–1
Commentary on the Sentences 95, 101
Manegold of Lautenbach, and *Glossa Ordinaria* 123
Mansueti da Perugia, Gaspare 101
Marcourt, Antoine 90
Mariology
maculist/immaculist views 24–5
and Scripture and tradition 144
and the Vulgate 131, 186
Marschalk, Nikolaus 64
Marsilius of Inghen 71, 74, 106
Martin V, Pope 17
Marx, Karl, and ideology 2–3
Mary, Virgin
assumption 16
immaculate conception 24–5
in lay devotion 12, 18, 24
as vessel of grace 131
Meinhardi, Andreas 105
Melanchthon, Philip
and Augustine 179
and Italian humanism 125–6
Loci Communes 65–6
Oratio de studiis linguae graecae 126
and Sorbonne 67
and theology and rhetoric 58, 65–6
and Tübingen University 73
and Wittenberg University 62, 164
merit 80–1, 85, 99
in Augustine 169
in Calvin 100
method
historico-critical 18, 23, 41, 48, 83–4, 132–3, 154, 167, 170–1
literary criticism 150
logico-critical 18, 20–2, 25, 74–8, 84, 167
Meyronnes, Francis de 195 n.30
Monaci, Lorenzo da 126
monasticism
and education 12
and reform 41
Moore, Robert I. 32
morality
and epistemology 73
and justification 53, 57–8, 114
and merit 80–1
and tropological sense of Scripture 53, 149–51, 154–5, 156, 161, 163
in Zurich Reformation 46, 49, 114, 147
Müller, Alphons Victor 82–3
Mutainus Rufus (Konrad Mutian) 41
Myconius, Friedrich 39, 46, 47

Nathin, Johannes 104, 109
nationalism
and heterodoxy 16, 189
and humanism 39, 47, 90

New Testament
and humanist concern for text 41–4, 54, 59, 126, 128–9, 173
and study of Greek 129–30, 135
and *textus receptus* 135–6
Nicholas of Cusa 196 n.42
Nicolas of Lyra 152, 160
nominalism
and problem of definition 68–73
see also Gregory of Rimini; *schola Augustiniana moderna*; *via moderna*; William of Ockham

Oberman, H. A.
and *schola Augustiniana moderna* 86, 97, 99, 104, 106–9
and Scripture and tradition 138–40, 143, 146
and *via moderna* 73
Oecolampadius, Johannes 61
Old Testament
and covenant 79
and knowledge of Hebrew 122, 127, 129, 151
literal interpretation 151–3, 155–6, 160
ontology
and justification 76–9, 85, 110
and two powers of God 74, 76–7
and William of Ockham 69–70, 74, 77
opinion, and dogma 16, 18, 25–8, 185–6
Orange, Second Council (529) 26
orders, religious, and theological schools 19–20
Oresme, Nicolas 74
Origen
and eloquence 167, 173
and hermeneutics 148, 153, 154–5, 179, 242 nn.11, 12, 243 n.17
Oudinus, Casimir 249–50 n.22
Oxford University
and Augustinianism 86
and Ockham 70, 74

pactum divinum theology *see* covenant
Paltz, Johannes de 24
papacy
and authority 139–40, 144
and definition of heresy 32
and late medieval crisis of authority 15–17
and Scripture 140–2, 147
Pardo, Jerónimo 218 n.23
Paris University
and Augustinianism 86–8, 99, 101
and Calvin 90–6, 99, 101
Collège de la Marche 90–2
Collège de Montaigu 90, 92–3, 94, 96
Collège de Navarre 94
Collège de Sainte Barbe 91–2
and critique of Luther 30
and *devotio moderna* 12
and Ockham 15, 67, 93
and papacy 15
and Sorbonne 50, 67, 92
theological faculty 15, 19
and *via antiqua* 93–4, 106
and *via moderna* 74, 93–6, 106
Paul of Burgos 152
Peasants' Revolt (1525) 130
Pelagianism
and Augustine 86–7, 99, 113, 169–72, 174, 175–6, 177–80
and Bradwardine 86–7, 170–1
of the church 25, 27, 171–2, 186
and Council of Carthage 26, 27
and doctrinal diversity 25–8
and nominalism 71
and *schola Augustiniana moderna* 86, 99
and *via moderna* 28, 98
Pellikan, Konrad 127, 250 n.23
penance
and Luther 108
and repentance 131–2, 170
and Vulgate 130–1, 186
Perez, Jacobus 24
Peter of Aquila 67
Peter of Candia 71

Peter the Chanter 232–3 n.17
Peter Martyr *see* Vermigli, Peter Martyr
philology
  and canon of Scripture 231–2 n.2
  and hermeneutics 129, 150–1, 153, 180, 186
  and humanism 41–2, 58–9, 64, 66, 125, 150–1, 153, 154
  and translation of Scripture 124, 127, 129, 131, 133–7
  and Zwingli 49
philosophia Christi, humanist 49–50, 63, 134
Pico della Mirandola, Giovanni 38, 126
piety, lay 11–15, 18, 24, 189
  and education 12
Pius II, Pope, *Execrabilis* 17
placards, *affaire des* 90, 98
Plekhanov, Georgii V. 3
pluralism, doctrinal 4, 8, 15, 18–29, 33, 185–6
  and crisis of authority 15–17, 24–5, 28–9, 185
  and dialectic between powers of God 20–1, 74–8, 85, 87
  and hermeneutics 121–47
  and justification 18, 21–2, 25–8
  and logico-critical method 18, 20–2, 25, 74–8, 84
  and opinion and dogma 16, 18, 25–8, 185–6
  and schools of theology 4, 18–20
politics, influence of 6–7, 47, 53, 157–8, 183, 189
predestination
  and diversity of doctrine 27, 86–7, 170
  double 86, 99, 179
  in Zwingli 51
Preus, J. S. 246 n.77
printing 39, 47, 134
  and doctrinal diversity 17
  and lay devotion 14
  and rediscovery of Augustine 169, 172, 173
  and translation of Old Testament 126–7
Prosper of Aquitaine, *Liber sententiarum ex operibus Augustini* 168
providence, in Zwingli 51
ps.-Augustine
  de vera et falsa poenitentia 60, 170, 178
  De vita Christiana 170
  Epistola ad Demetriadem 170
  Hypomnesticon 23–4, 170
Pupper, Johannes 29

Quadriga 148–50, 157, 161, 163–5
Quintillian, Marcus Fabius 50, 61, 65

Radical Reformation, intellectual origins vii
Rashi (Solomon ben Isaac) 151
realism
  "biblical" 79
  and nominalism 68–9, 72, 73
  and *schola Augustiniana moderna* 84
Reformation
  "forerunners" 1, 8, 29–33, 96, 137, 191 n.10
  as heterogeneous vii, 1, 6, 8, 168, 181, 182–9
  as inevitable 188–9
  and late medieval theology 2, 3–4, 5–6, 7–8, 11–33
  local factors vii, 182–3
  periodization 5
  polarization between Lutheran and Reformed 6–7, 114–15, 188
  and Renaissance 2, 5, 180–1, 182
  seen as homogeneous 29, 183
  and social factors vii–viii, 2–3, 5, 182–3, 189
  see also Lutheran Reformation; Reformed church
Reformed church, intellectual origins vii, 30–1, 33, 103–15, 183
  and foreign influence 7
  and humanism 44–58, 153, 185, 188

and late medieval theology 6, 32–3, 81–2, 88–103
and patristic testimony 167–8, 174–6, 180–1
and politics 47, 53, 157–8
and scholasticism 36, 54, 88–103, 115, 184–5
and Zurich disputation 44–5, 146, 157–8
Reformed theology
and hermeneutics 147, 153–9, 185
and justification 57–8, 114, 187–8
and moralism 49, 114, 147
and *sola scriptura* principle 45, 146–7, 157–8, 188
see also Bucer, Martin; Calvin, John; Zwingli, Huldrych
Renaissance
and humanism 35–9, 40, 41, 125, 184
and pan-European culture 183
and Reformation 2, 5, 180–1, 182
repentance, and penance 131–2, 170
return *ad fontes* 42, 64, 119–20
and hermeneutics 151, 157, 165
and knowledge of Greek and Hebrew 125–30
and quest for eloquence 125–6, 129
and sacred philology 134–5
and *testimonium patrum* 167, 173
Retz, Johannes von 222 n.78
Reuchlin, Johannes
De rudimentibus Hebraicis 127–8, 134, 151
and Erasmus 136
and Leipzig Disputation 62–3
Psalterium Quincuplex 134
Reuter, Karl 94–7, 99, 100–1
revelation
and accommodation 53–4
natural 56–7
in Scripture 120
and tradition 139, 140–1
Rhenanus, Beatus 52
rhetoric
and Calvin 54–5, 57, 58
in humanism 36–7, 41, 44, 125, 154, 167
and Luther 65
and Melanchthon 58, 65–6
and principle of accommodation 54–5
Ricoeur, Paul 183
righteousness of God
in Augustine 113, 177
in Karlstadt 178
in Luther 111–14, 145, 149, 161, 162–3, 177
and *via moderna* 81
Roland of Cremona 19
Roscellin 68
Rubellus, Michael (Röttli) 48
Ruchrat, Johannes 29

sacraments
and Calvin 7, 98
and tradition 142
and the Vulgate 131
and Zwingli 51, 175
sanctification, in Calvin 58
Scheurl, Christoph 59, 61, 64, 105, 106–7, 252 n.64
schola Augustiniana moderna 2, 82–8, 184
and Calvin 94, 96–7, 99–102
and dialectic between powers of God 19–20, 22, 74–5, 85, 87, 94
and epistemology 99
and justification 27, 77, 99, 110–11
and Luther 103–4, 105, 107–12, 145, 146, 184
and nominalism 87–8, 101
and the past 94
and Pelagianism 86
and predestination 179
and *sola scriptura* principle 145, 146
and soteriology 86–8, 111, 171
and textual analysis 167, 170
and theocentricity 184
and Vermigli 102

schola Augustiniana moderna (*cont'd*)
and *via moderna* 85–6, 87–8, 96
at Wittenberg 104, 105–6, 107–9, 180
scholasticism
and Calvin 54, 90–1, 94–101
and hermeneutics 64–5, 148–50, 163–5, 184, 187
and humanism 34–5, 40, 43, 46, 63, 78, 180
and justification 76–8, 110
and Mariology 24
and nominalism 68–73
opposition to 14–15, 30
and origins of Reformation 2, 7–8, 43, 182–4: Lutheran 6, 60–1, 67, 103–15, 184; Reformed 36, 54, 88–103, 115, 184–5
and reception of Augustine 168–72
and vernacular Bible 130
see also William of Ockham
schools, theological, late medieval 18–20, 185
Schüssler, H. 144
Scotism *see* Duns Scotus
Scripture *see* Bible
sententiae 23, 60
Septuagint, and Hebrew text 132
Seripando, Girolamo 83, 102, 230 n.99
sin, original 24, 99
society, and theology 4
Socinus, Laelius, and merit 100
sodalities, humanist 34, 40, 63, 90, 114, 183, 187
sola scriptura principle 144–7
and Bradwardine 146, 240 n.120
and Gregory of Rimini 145
and hermeneutics 129–30, 148
and Luther 44, 130, 145–6, 177–8
in Reformed theology 45, 146–7, 157–8, 188
and *schola Augustiniana moderna* 145, 146
and tradition 137–8, 145
and Zwingli 45, 157
Soncino, Paolo da 101
Sorbonne 92
and Melanchthon 67
and Zwingli 50
soteriology
of Augustine 23, 170–1, 177
of Gregory of Rimini 71, 73, 107
of Karlstadt 113–14, 165
of Luther 110–13, 145, 163–4, 165, 177, 184, 229 n.190
and nominalism 71, 72, 73, 107, 229 n.190
and *schola Augustiniana moderna* 86–8, 111, 171
of Vermigli 102
and *via moderna* 79, 86, 87–8, 98, 111–15
of Zwingli 49, 80
see also justification
source criticism *see* method, historico-critical
Spalatin, Georg 61, 214 n.151
Sprüngli, Adam 158
Stakemeier, Eduard 82–3, 102
Standonck, Jan 193 n.13
Stange, Carl 19, 82, 103
Staupitz, Johannes von 24, 104, 107–9, 162, 179
Steinbach, Wendelin 74, 132, 153, 160, 165
Steinhöwel, Heinrich 205 n.31
Steinmetz, David C. 248 n.2
studia humanitatis 5, 38
Stunica, Jacobus Lopez de 136
Summenhart, Conrad 73
Switzerland
and Franco-Italian war 47
and heterogeneity of reform 183
and humanism 46–50, 89–90, 114
and nationalism 16, 39, 47, 90
and Reformed theology 6
see also Basle; Geneva; Zurich
synods, provincial and diocesan 29

terminism, logical 68–9, 72, 96, 99, 102

testimonium patrum 166, 167–81
and origins of Lutheran theology 176–81
and origins of Reformed theology 154, 174–6
theologia crucis 160, 177, 247 n.85
theology, late medieval 2, 3–4, 5–6, 7–8, 11–33
and Bible and tradition 137–44, 146–7
and biblical text 133–7
and the church 4, 15–17
and doctrinal pluralism 4, 8, 15, 18–29, 185–6
as exposition of Scripture 186
and Forerunners of the Reformation 8, 29–33, 147
and heresy 31–2
and law 139–40
logico-critical method 18, 20–2, 25, 74–8, 84
and Lutheran theology 3, 103–15, 184
natural 56–7, 71
and priority of Scripture 120–1, 129, 148, 150
and realist-nominalist debate 73
reform 6, 58–9, 61, 63
and Reformed theology 6, 32–3, 81–2, 88–103
and religious orders 19–20
and rise of lay religion 11–15
schools 18–20
and *sola scriptura* principle 144–5
systematic 65–6
see also schola Augustiniana moderna; scholasticism; *via moderna*
Thomas of Strasbourg 24, 84, 85–6
Thomism, and the church 144
Tierney, Brian 140
Toffannin, Giuseppe 35, 36
tradition and Scripture 137–44
in Luther 146
"single source" theory 138–9, 142, 146
"two source" theory 139–43, 146
Trapp, Damasus 84, 87
Trent, Council
and Augustinian school 83
and Franciscans 20
and justification 26, 28, 77, 83
and scholasticism 215–16 n.1
and Scripture and tradition 137, 146
Trümpy, Hans 47–8
Trutvetter, Jodocus 104, 105, 106–7
Tübingen University
and critique of Luther 30
and *devotio moderna* 12
and realism and nominalism 73
Tweedale, Martin 69
typology, and allegory 155

Ullman, Karl H. 29
Unam sanctam (papal bull) 15
universities
and humanism viii
and reforming movements 97, 183
and theological schools 16, 19–20, 105–6

Vadian, Joachim 39, 46–7, 206 n.47
Valla, Lorenzo 38
Adnotationes 134
Collatio 133–4
and *Donation of Constantine* 23, 48, 128
and philology 59, 128, 134
and text of New Testament 41, 126, 128, 131
vera theologia
and Augustine 61, 63, 174–5
and exegesis 129
at Wittenberg 59, 61–3, 104, 114–15, 175
Vermigli, Peter Martyr, early theological development 2, 101–3
vernacular, use of
and humanism 41
and Luther 129–30
and Scripture 122–4, 129–30
and Wycliffe 124, 137

via antiqua 27–8, 73, 87
and Calvin 90
in Cologne 19, 104
and epistemology 84
and grace 27
and logico-critical method 20
in Paris 93–4, 106
and realism 72
and voluntarism 81
in Wittenberg 105
and Zwingli 88–9
see also Aquinas, St Thomas; Duns Scotus
via moderna 46, 73–82
and Calvin 2, 90–8
and the church 144, 186
and dialectic of two powers of God 20–2, 74–8, 87, 94
and divine will 81
and ethics 79
and justification 25–8, 76–7, 110–11, 162
and local diversity 74
and logico-critical method 20–2, 25, 74–8
and Luther 2, 25–6, 27–8, 64, 97, 103–5, 107, 110–13, 186
and nominalism 73–4, 85, 87–8, 96
in Paris 93–6
and Pelagianism 28, 98
and soteriology 79, 86, 87–8, 98, 111–15, 184
at Wittenberg 74, 105–7, 112, 114–15
see also Biel, Gabriel; William of Ockham
Vienna University
and Swiss humanism 46, 48
and *via moderna* 19, 46, 103
Vignaux, Paul 69
Viret, Pierre 175
Volmar, Melchior 48
voluntarism
and Calvin 99–101
and Ockham 80–1, 100–1
and *schola Augustiniana moderna* 99, 100–1
and *via antiqua* 81
and *via moderna* 74, 80–2, 99–100
de Vooght, P. 144, 240 n.117
Vulgate
as authoritative 119, 121–5, 129, 133, 186–7
critique 49, 130–7, 186
revision 121–2, 126, 128

Walafrid Strabo, and *Glossa Ordinaria* 123
Werner, Karl 82
Westphal, Joachim 7
William of Ockham
and authority in the church 15–16, 19
and Calvin 95, 100–1
and Erfurt 104
and incarnation 22, 94
and nominalism 68–72, 74, 88, 96, 106
and "Ockham's Razor" 74
Opus nonaginta dierum 15
and papacy 15–16, 142
and Paris University 15, 67, 93
and powers of God 21, 74, 76–7, 219–20 n.42
Tractatus contra Johannem 15
and voluntarism 80–1, 100–1
William of Ware 84
Wittenberg disputation (1516) 59–61, 62, 97, 178
Wittenberg Reformation *see* Lutheran Reformation; Wittenberg University
Wittenberg University
and hermeneutics 164–5
and late medieval theology 67–8, 147, 178
and Luther 43, 59–62, 105–7, 112, 164
and *schola Augustiniana moderna* 104, 105–6, 107–9, 180
and study of Hebrew 128

and theological reform 59–62, 63, 103, 114–15, 178–80, 183
and *via antiqua* 105
and *via moderna* 74, 105–7, 112, 114–15
Wodeham, Adam 70, 72, 84
Word of God
in biblical text 42, 129, 148
in Luther 65, 129, 161–2
and reform 180
Wycliffe, John
and Bradwardine 86
as Forerunner of Reformation 37, 147
and papacy 143
and Scripture and tradition 146, 147
and vernacular Bible 124, 137
Wyle, Niklas von 205 n.31
Wyttenbach, Thomas 48

Xylotectus 46

Zanchi, Girolamo 102
Zenzellinus de Cassanis 142
Zumkeller, Adolar 84–5
Zurich
city council 45, 157–8
as Reformed center 188
Zurich Reformation *see* Calvin, John; "First Zurich Disputation"; Reformed church; Reformed theology; Zwingli, Huldrych
Zwingli, Huldrych
and Augustine 174–5, 176, 180–1
and the Bible 129, 187
Commentarius de vera et falsa religione 50, 51–2, 115
and covenantal theology 80
De providentia Dei 51
and Duns Scotus 67, 88–90
early theological development 2, 88–90
and Erasmus 48–52, 89–90, 153–6, 185, 187
and Franco-Italian war 47
and free will 51
and hermeneutics 49, 153–9, 187
and humanism 39, 46, 48–52, 89–90, 114, 129, 154–6, 175
and justification 187
and Luther 48–9
marginalization 188
and nationalism 39, 90
and origins of Reformation 30
and philology 49
and reform of the church 49–50, 52
as Reformer 50, 89
Reply to Hubmeier 80
and scholasticism 185
and *sola scriptura* 45, 157
and soteriology 49, 80
and spiritualism 51
and Zurich Council 157–8

Index compiled by Meg Davies (Registered Indexer, Society of Indexers)